DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 663 TE 001 462

By-Grommon, Alfred H.

A History of the Preparation of Teachers of English.

Pub Date Apr 68

Note-42p.

Journal Cit-English Journal; v57 n4 p484-524 Apr 1968

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.20

Descriptors-Education Majors, *English Education, *English Instruction, Inservice Teacher Education, Methods Courses, Microteaching, Preservice Education, Specialization, Student Teaching, *Teacher Associations, Teacher Background, Teacher Certification, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Education Curriculum, Teacher Educators, Teacher Programs, Teachers Colleges

This chronological survey, extending from the laws passed in 1642 in Massachusetts to establish schools for the teaching of reading and writing to the 1968 Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English, presents a discussion of varying attitudes toward English teaching and English teacher education. Divergent opinions on many topics are included: teacher certification, college entrance requirements, high school and college English programs, teacher specialization, the importance of literary criticism in teacher education, the establishment of teacher societies, and the exercise of guidance by the societies. Incorporated in the discussion are references to the major contributors to and the significant documents concerning English educational theory and practice. (LH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED030663

ENGLISH JOURNAL

The Official Journal of the Secondary Section of
National Council of Teachers of English

Editor: RICHARD S. ALM
University of Hawaii

Volume 57 | April 1968 | Number 4

An Issue within an Issue:
Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English—An Exposition
Compiled by: Michael F. Shugrue, Modern Language Association and
Eldonna L. Evertts, National Council of Teachers of English

I *An Introduction to the English Teacher Preparation Study*
The Uses of the Guidelines — *Willis H. Umberger* — 475
The Importance of the Study — *John Hurt Fisher* — 477
The Study in Retrospect — *William P. Viall* — 478
Introduction to the Guidelines — *James R. Squire* — 479

II *Teacher Preparation and the English Classroom*
The English Teacher as Professional — *Albert H. Marckwardt* — 480
A History of the Preparation of Teachers of English — *Alfred H. Grommon* — 484
The History of ETPS — *Michael F. Shugrue* — 525

III *English Teacher Preparation Study: Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English—1968* — 528

IV *Classic Statements on Teacher Preparation in English*
- The 1958 NASDTEC Declaration of Policy on Teacher Education and Certification — 537
- From *The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English* and "An Articulated English Program" — 537
- "A Standard of Preparation To Teach English" from *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* — 540
- "Resolutions Adopted at a Seminar of English Department Chairmen" — 542
- "Major Recommendations for Educating Teachers of English for the Elementary School" from *The Education of Teachers of English* — 543

TE001 462

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY National Council of
Teachers of English and author
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE
THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF
THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

A History of the Preparation of Teachers of English

Alfred H. Grommon

Professor of Education and English
Stanford University
President, National Council of Teachers of English

THE Guidelines developed in the English Teacher Preparation Study are but the latest in a long line of documents related to the preparation of teachers of English for the schools. The parallels and significant differences in the procedures by which these Guidelines were developed, in the nature and scope of the recommendations, in the sanctions they represent, and in the prospects of their influence may be more apparent, however, when placed in the context of a century of concern with the caliber and preparation of teachers of English. Efforts in this direction a century ago were addressed, first, to establishing the status of English as a school subject; second, to improving the quality and preparation of all teachers; and, third, as English gradually became accepted as a subject, to becoming more concerned with special training for teachers of English.

As early as 1642 and 1647, laws were passed in Massachusetts to establish schools for the teaching of English, largely reading and writing. And in 1749, Franklin justified the importance of English as a part of the program for the academy in Philadelphia. Yet as late as the 1860's and 1870's, English was generally of little importance in American schools and colleges.

But, in 1869, Charles W. Eliot announced his concern with the quality of education offered in our schools and colleges. Upon the occasion of his inauguration as President of Harvard College, he devoted his address to discussing a range of educational problems. Regarding the failure of talks taking place at that time to add much to the "staple of education," he said, "A striking illustration may be found in the prevailing neglect of the systematic study of the English language."[1] He went on to argue for the enlargement of the American educational program extending from the elementary school through college. He stressed that "the needed reformation in methods of teaching the subjects which have already been nominally admitted to the American curriculum applies not only to the university, but to the preparatory schools down to the primary. The American college is obliged to supplement the American school. Whatever elementary instruction the schools fail to give, the college must supply."[2] Then he announced the Harvard faculty's recent decision to establish some admission requirements, including the offering of prizes for reading aloud and "for

[1] Charles William Eliot, *Educational Reform* (New York: The Century Co., 1898), p. 2.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

the critical analysis of passages from English authors."[3]

In 1873-74, however, Harvard changed this entrance examination in English significantly by instituting a test requiring the applicant to demonstrate his ability to use English grammar and rhetoric by writing a composition acceptable to the Harvard faculty on a topic related to certain selections of English literature. Not long after, colleges throughout New England and other parts of the country established their own versions of an admissions examination testing candidates' preparation in English composition and literature.

These examinations, and particularly the canon of set-books upon which the tests were based, had enormous, far-reaching effects upon the importance of English in the schools, the courses of study, the amount of time allotted to the study of English, methods of teaching, and the growing demand for teachers especially trained to teach English. Corollary activities also developed among English teachers but for somewhat different purposes. They objected to the superimposing of a college preparatory program, particularly the long lists of classics picked by the colleges, upon *all* high schools student. Some began to develop programs of writing, language, and literature more in keeping with students not preparing for college. This opposition led to the formation of regional groups of English teachers and ultimately the National Council of Teachers of English.

President Eliot continued his vigorous campaign to establish the importance of English in schools and colleges. In June 1884, he gave an address at Johns Hopkins University on "What Is Liberal Education?" He discussed what he considered to be indispensable components of a liberal education. He proceeded to justify his elevating certain modern subjects to "equal academic value and rank with any subject now most honored." The first is English. He pointed out the contrast between the importance of the array of English writers and the greatness of their literature and the low status of the subject in many schools and its absence from some. He reported that the modest English test required for admission to colleges revealed "the woeful ignorance of their own language and literature which prevails among the picked youth of the country."[4] He went on to explain that "For ten years past Harvard University has been trying, first, to stimulate the preparatory schools to give attention to English, and, secondly, to develop and improve its own instruction in that department; but its success has thus far been very moderate. So little attention is paid to English at the preparatory schools that half of the time, labor, and money which the University spends upon English must be devoted to the mere elements of the subject. . . . This comparative neglect of the greatest of literatures in American schools and colleges is certainly a remarkable phenomenon." Later in the same address he said that "English should be studied from the beginning of school life to the end of college life." This problem of the status of English relative to that of other subjects prompted the Department of Secondary Instruction of the National Education Association in 1887 to approve unanimously a resolution stating that "In the opinion of the department, the English language should be given at least an equal place with that of the classics and science in the high school's course of study."[5]

In many of his talks in the 1880s and 1890s Eliot stressed the importance of developing the school programs and of giving greater importance to certain subjects such as English, history, modern languages, natural sciences, "political economy." But he also emphasized the accompanying need for better teachers, for teachers' examinations, for a better tenure system, for a higher proportion of male teachers, who are more likely than women to make teaching their lifework, for effective supervision of probationary teachers, for teachers "prepared to specialize in teaching one subject" and adapt instruction to children of different

---

[3] For an account of some of the early history of aspects of English in American schools, see Joseph Mersand's informative essay, "The Teaching of Literature in American High Schools, 1865-1900," *Perspectives on Teaching, Essays To Honor W. Wilbur Hatfield* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960), pp. 271-302.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.

[5] *NEA Proceedings* (1887), p. 395.

ages and abilities, and for changing American teaching that tends to be "chiefly driving and judging" to the kind that is "leading and inspiring."[6] In an address to the Harvard Teachers' Association in 1896, Eliot reported that "English has now won a good place in school programmes and in college requirements for admission to college. What a marvel it is that it never had any place at all down to 1873, when it first appeared in the Harvard requirements."

THROUGHOUT the 1890s and the first decade of the twentieth century, the increasing number of articles in professional journals and the initial textbooks on the teaching of English and the training of English teachers testify to the acceptance of the front-rank importance of the field and to the need for teachers especially prepared to teach it. But unquestionably the most significant educational development at the end of the century was the work of the Committee of Ten, appointed by the NEA in 1892 to make a study of secondary school programs. President Eliot of Harvard was appointed chairman of this distinguished committee composed of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the presidents of the Universities of Michigan, Colorado, and Missouri, and of Vassar College, a professor at Oberlin, the headmasters of a boys' and a girls' independent schools, and the principal of a public high school. The Committee appointed a Conference to investigate the programs of each of nine subjects commonly taught in secondary schools. Of the ninety persons who worked on these Conferences, forty-seven represented colleges and universities, forty-two were from secondary schools, and one was a governmental officer who had formerly been on the staff of a university. They studied the programs in over two hundred secondary schools in many parts of the country.[7]

Of concern here, though, are the occasional references in this influential document to the preparation of teachers. In his commentary introducing the reports of the Conferences on the nine subjects, Eliot reminds the reader that throughout each report the Conference states that if schools were to adopt the recommendations for improving the subjects studied in high schools, then teachers of higher academic caliber and with better preparation, especially in effective methods of teaching, would be needed not only in elementary and secondary schools but also in the model schools, normal schools, and colleges in which they are prepared. It was his opinion that these institutions were "capable of making prompt and successful efforts to supply the better trained and equipped teachers for whom the reports of the Conferences call."[8] He particularly called to the attention of colleges and universities their responsibilities for preparing teachers for elementary and secondary schools. The Conference on English made one specific recommendation that the teacher of English:

> must of course be familiar with the more important facts of historical English grammar, and be able to use them in connection with the study of any branch of English, whenever they serve to explain difficulties or to fix grammatical principles. And he must also be able to teach dialects and literary language authority and usage, and the decay of inflections.[9]

Even though this reference seems to be about the only specific recommendation on

---

[6] Eliot's reference here to the importance of recognizing and adjusting to children's individual differences becomes almost a refrain throughout his addresses, especially in his criticism of schools for the undesirable conformity they insist upon in pupils and in the reforms he proposed. It is also consistent with the system of electives he had already instituted at Harvard. This part of his crusade is in puzzling contrast, however, to the unanimous stands taken in the *Report of the Committee of Ten* (1894), known as "Dr. Eliot's Committee," that schools should make no adjustments in the courses recommended by the Committee for any students, no matter how different their "destinations" might be.

[7] *Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies* (New York: The American Book Company, 1894), p. 11.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 18.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

the preparation of the teacher of English, one should not be surprised by this lack. At about the time this Committee and two others were working, many articles on these studies—pro and con—and on other aspects of education in the schools were appearing in professional journals. For example, in the first ten years of *School Review*, 1893-1903, many articles appeared on the teaching of English in elementary and secondary schools. But only two were on the English teacher's preparation.[10] And the writers of these two articles seemed concerned almost exclusively with what the individual prospective teacher should get out of experiences in courses in literature and composition and with his personal qualities and abilities. They did not seem to be at all aware of the possibility that colleges might be responsible for offering some kind of program or selection of courses and experiences organized for the benefit of students preparing to teach.

The makeup and procedures of this Committee and its conferences, however, are extremely important. They set a pattern of close cooperation among universities, colleges, schools, and governmental agencies in working on educational problems that is followed to this day. In July 1894, Eliot spoke to the American Institute of Instruction. At that time, his *Report* had been available to the public for six months. In his address, "The Unity of Educational Reform," he proposed to take up some of the criticisms and objections that had already been published, chiefly the question, "What do college men know about the schools?" He pointed out, first, the extensive school experiences of the persons who worked on the Conferences, and, second, that the reforms called for apply throughout the range of the educational system from primary school to university. He closed on this note:

> If I were asked to mention the best part of the contribution which the Committee of Ten have made to the progress of American education, I should say that their general method of work was the best part,—the method of investigation and discussion by subject of instruction,—teachers and experts from all sorts of colleges and universities, and from all sorts of schools, public, private, and endowed, taking part in both investigation and discussion. The Committee's method of work emphasizes the community of interest in all grades, and the fact that experience at every grade is valuable for suggestion and counsel at all other grades. To my way of thinking, the present artificial and arbitrary distinctions between elementary and secondary schools, or between grammar schools and high schools, have no philosophical foundation, and are likely to be profoundly modified, if they do not altogether pass away. . . .
>
> On the whole, the greatest promise of usefulness which I see in the Report of the Committee of Ten lies in its obvious tendency to promote cooperation among school and college teachers, and all other persons intelligently interested in education, for the advancement of well-marked and comprehensive reforms.[11]

THE work undertaken by the Committee of Ten led the NEA to appoint two other committees to study certain aspects of the schools: a Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education[12] and a Committee of Twelve on Rural Schools.[13] The Committee of Fifteen Sub-Committee on the Training of Teachers was composed of five superintendents of public schools representing various sections of the country. On the basis of

---

[10] Samuel Thurber, "The Teacher's Equipment for Work in English Literature," *School Review*, (February 1894); J. F. Genung, "The Teacher's Outfit in Rhetoric," *School Review*, (September 1895). "Equipment" and "Outfit," quaint terms indeed in this context, then seemed to be fashionable diction in discussions of professional preparation to teach.

[11] Eliot, *op. cit.*, pp. 337-339.

[12] *Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education with the Reports of the Sub-Committee: On the Training of Teachers; on the Correlation of Studies in Elementary Education; On the Organization of City School Systems* (New York: The American Book Company, 1895).

[13] *Report of the Committee of Twelve on Rural Schools* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1897).

information and recommendations received through a questionnaire and letters, the Sub-Committee made several recommendations for improving the preparation of teachers for elementary and secondary schools.

One of the more interesting, perhaps prophetic suggestions is that, prior to assuming full responsibility as a practice teacher, the student should begin by teaching for some time a small group of children so that he could study the individual child as he learns new ideas. The student could then learn to modify his lesson plans in order to adapt his subject matter and activities to the "child's tastes and activities." Here is an early version of what is now known as micro-teaching.

The Committee also stressed the importance of the "training" of teachers for secondary schools and for normal schools, claiming that secondary school teachers "give educational tone to communities, as well as inspiration to the body of teachers," and that those who teach in normal schools "need broad scholarship, thorough understanding of educational problems, and trained experience. . . ."[14]

With its recommendation for a postgraduate year of training for teachers, the Committee also anticipated our present fifth-year and internship programs. During that year, the student would be employed by the school in which he would do his practice teaching all morning. Afternoons he would attend college classes, particularly those with a "professor of pedagogy," who would also arrange occasional meetings with heads of departments in which the student was teaching. Then on Saturday mornings he would participate in a two-hour seminar conducted by the professor of pedagogy and attended also by the "more ambitious teachers of experience in the vicinity." The Committee reported that such a program for secondary school teachers was planned by Brown University and the Providence High School for the next year.[15] This cooperative arrangement is further evidence of the importance given at that early date to a close liaison between colleges and schools to develop preservice and inservice training of teachers.

A subcommittee of the Committee of Twelve also studied aspects of the supply of teachers: normal schools, training schools in high schools and academies, summer training schools, institutes, provisions for inservice education, teachers' meetings and associations, reading circles, libraries, current literature, the ways teachers were hired, and salaries. The Committee reported that perhaps the most important subject assigned to it was the "training and preparation of teachers." But it did not clarify the distinction between training and preparation.

Two of the Committee's recommendations have particular relevance today. First, it urged normal schools to see that their programs for prospective teachers reflect more than they did "the environment and probable future life of the children in the schools. . . ." The question of relevance is especially acute today in programs preparing teachers to work with disadvantaged schools.[16] Second, it said that communities must show a "clearer appreciation of the qualities essential to a good teacher. It is too often the case that no distinction is made between a teacher of superior scholarship, of proved ability in instruction and discipline, of long experience, and one far inferior in all qualities essential to success."[17]

The historic significance of these committees and their reports at the turn of the century lies, then, not in specific recommendations for the selection and preparation of teachers of English for elementary and secondary schools, for at that time the very place of English as a school subject was in question. Despite Eliot's longtime convictions of its importance and his vigorous support of it in his many addresses,

---

[14] *Report of the Committee of Fifteen*, pp. 34, 35.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[16] See the chapter on "Teacher Education" in Richard Corbin and Muriel Crosby, eds., *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged*, Report of the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1965).

[17] *Report of the Committee of Twelve on Rural Schools*, pp. 77-78.

the report of his own Committee, which a member of the Committee referred to as "Dr. Eliot's report," shows that the majority of the Committee considered English to be of secondary importance, inferior to Latin and Greek. Nor does the significance lie in any influence it might have had on the political aspects of hiring or firing teachers or on ways of judging whether teachers were qualified. Apparently it had none. The importance lies instead in its longtime but debatable influence upon the curricula in the schools and in the Committee's exemplifying the great value of the genuine commitment of the most prestigious representatives of major universities and colleges to help improve education in this country by working closely, and over a long period of time, with superintendents, principals, headmasters, teachers, and representatives of state and federal governments. We still benefit from this rich legacy.

FOR further developments in the growing concern with the preparation of teachers of English between the work of these committees and the founding of the NCTE, we need to turn to the writings of individual teachers. J. F. Genung and the prolific Samuel Thurber have already been mentioned. Texts on the teaching of English began to appear as early as 1887, Alexander Bain's *On Teaching English* (Longmans). Percival Chubb's *The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School*, an influential text, was first published by Macmillan in 1902 but went through revisions as late as 1929. At least two early texts had comments or sections also on the preparation of teachers of English.

B. A. Hinsdale, a Professor of the Art and Science of Teaching at the University of Michigan, published in 1896 *Teaching the Language-Arts: Speech, Reading, Composition* (Appleton). In discussing the qualifications of the teacher of language arts, he gives primary importance to "clear perception of the elements of the arts, their relations to real knowledge, and skill in bringing these elements into connection with young minds." Although he doesn't seem to explain what he means by "real knowledge," he apparently means academic subject matter. He was against the specialization of teachers in elementary schools and departmental method of teaching. He questioned also specialization even in high school where he found it was sometimes "carried to a harmful extent." He predicted, however, that "the time will come when a special teacher of English should be employed."[18]

Of far greater importance in this development is a textbook written by three writers who did believe in specialization in English and in the unification of the subject. They were George R. Carpenter and Franklin T. Baker, Professors of English at Columbia, and Fred N. Scott, Professor of English at the University of Michigan, who wrote *The Teaching of English in Elementary and the Secondary School*, published in 1903 (Longmans). It was revised and reissued up to 1927. Scott wrote the section on "The Teacher and His Training." He discusses the purposes of training in the teaching of English, special and general qualifications, and some components of what the teacher should know and be able to teach.

Scott believed that the main purpose of special training "is to give the teacher, not knowledge of his subject, but self-knowledge; not knowledge of methods of teaching, but resources to meet the exigencies of the classroom."[19] The teacher should be able to "speak and write the English language with clearness, accuracy, and freedom from bookishness" or "schoolmaster's English." He should have extensive knowledge of *both* English and American literature and the history of these literatures. This is probably the earliest stipulation that an English teacher should also know American literature. Scott then offers suggestions on how to read literature and some guides on how extensively the teacher should read. The teacher should know one foreign language well, ancient or modern, even those teaching in the elementary grades. Readers familiar with the experi-

---

[18] *Teaching the Language-Arts*, pp. 199-200.
[19] *The Teaching of English*, p. 307.

ences of developing the ETPS Guidelines will readily recall the agonizing over this issue. And Scott offers somewhat the same rationale as that presented in the Guidelines: to help the teacher better understand the nature of his mother tongue. He says also that a knowledge of Old English is desirable. He thought that the teacher, however, could study Old English on his own more easily than he could a foreign language.

Scott believed that a teacher's special qualifications should include his learning how to read and "correct" compositions and "scholarship in the history and theory of rhetoric." Aware of the teacher's possible abuse of this knowledge by unloading "his erudition on the class," Scott says that even if this is so, "ignorance of one's subject is no safeguard in the classroom."[20]

He was much exercised about teachers' preparation to teach grammar and their silly notions about language. He says that if it is true that grammar is the worst taught part of the English curriculum, then it is so because so few teachers "have made special preparation for teaching grammar." Continuing in this modern vein, he says that, to him, special preparation included the teacher's becoming acquainted with the best school textbooks, having a knowledge of the development of the English language and of the science of language, and studying the psychology of speech. He wanted the teacher to be rid of "superstitious reverence for grammatical rules" and gain insight into the "true nature of usage and idiom." And what date should we attach to the following?

> From the study of the psychology of speech he will learn through what processes the child acquires his native tongue and how the various elements of this language present themselves to the child-mind at different stages of its development. The total outcome of this study should be to give the teacher a new conception of the meaning of English grammar and its place in the curriculum. He should cease to regard it as a study merely of abstract rules and formulas; he should come to see that the underlying subject is virtually the same as that which underlies composition and literature, namely, the expressive and communicative activities of the English-speaking race. And he should come to see that in teaching grammar his chief duty is to awaken the minds of his students to the meaning of their familiar modes of expression. This knowledge, of itself, if it could be brought home to the consciousness of the teacher, would effect a revolution in the teaching of English grammar.[21]

The year was 1903.

Scott believed that this teacher should also know something about the "underlying principles of literary criticism" so that he can continue to read and study independently without being "bewildered by the contradictory opinions of belligerent critics, or be overawed by the solemn platitudes of self-constituted authorities. . . . He is also less likely to be tainted with the shallow sentimentalism which in some schools takes the place of intelligent appreciation." Finally, he urges him to study comparative literature even though the subject was not yet established. Because he considered the subject important, one certain to gain stature, he recommends that the "ambitious teacher of literature" would do well "to follow with some care the progress of this branch of his chosen subject."[22]

SCOTT'S program in 1903 is much more than a first step in defining specialized preparation for a teacher of English. It is a giant stride reaching far into this century. It anticipates current recommendations and closely parallels some, even his supporting rationale: American and comparative literatures, how to read literature, studying a foreign language, a substantial program in the English language including the modern study of it, methods of teaching and evaluating writing, and especially his emphasis of the importance of studying the "psychology of speech." His awareness of

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 317.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 317.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 318.

the problems, his sense of the urgencies and realities of what should be done, his commitment to the improvement of the preparation of teachers of English and the teaching of English, all this involvement led Fred N. Scott to join with James Fleming Hosic of the Chicago Normal College and Edwin L. Miller of the Detroit Public Schools to found the National Council of Teachers of English, in 1911.

Scott was the first president of the Council and served during its first two years, 1912-1913. He established much of what is still the pattern of the organization. Because of his prestige as a scholar, critic, author, teacher, and his stature in the Modern Language Association, his influence, according to James R. Squire, did much to win for the Council the respect of members of college and university faculties.

Hosic became Secretary-Treasurer of the Council. In 1912, he established the *English Journal*. Even though he owned it, the *Journal* became the official organ of the Council. Its early issues reveal the increased activities and interests within the Council in the teaching of English, courses of study in the schools, the preparation of teachers of English, and close cooperation between the NEA and this fledgling organization that grew out of the English section of the NEA and its protests against the effects of college admissions examinations in English upon high school English courses and methods of teaching being used to prepare college-bound students for these external examinations. At that time, Hosic was chairman of the NEA Committee on College-Entrance Examinations in English. The Committee's report appears in the *Addresses and Proceedings of the NEA, 1912*, of the meetings held in Chicago, the home of the infant NCTE.

The growing enthusiasm in the 1912 meetings of the English section and in the Council for specialized training in English was tempered somewhat, however, by the strictures expressed by Vincil C. Coulter, Head of the English Department, State Normal School, Warrensburg, Missouri, who spoke on "Desirable Equipment for English Work." He opposed the organizing of subject-matter departments in secondary schools because the advantages blind us to what he saw as being serious disadvantages, one of which was the increasing "demand for more highly trained teachers." He thought that certain kinds of specialization would be a distinct gain for secondary schools. But he objected to the kind of "higher training" that:

> has too often taken the form of advanced training in special lines and has given us teachers who present their material from the standpoint of specialists in history, or science, or literature, rather than from the standpoint of specialists in the education of children. Specialization in English in our universities in the form of the preparation of a "contribution to knowledge," known as the Master's thesis or a Doctor's dissertation, usually has no relation to the preparation for efficient teaching in the schools. In fact, this specialization too frequently results in just so much useless lumber which the unfortunate possessor must get rid of before effective work can be done. This inadequacy in the training of the teachers for the schools brings them to their work unprepared to meet the actual problem of teaching, and unable to take active steps toward the building-up of a working equipment of method and material. The actual work of the English teacher in the school seems to be further removed from the special work he has taken in our universities by way of training than that of any other teacher.[23]

This issue of relevance is, of course, still alive. It was raised by Eliot, by the Committees of Twelve and Fifteen, by Thurber and Scott, by the Hosic Committee on the Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools, by Walter Barnes, by the NCTE Curriculum Commission that published *An Experience Curriculum*, by Warner Rice who, while chairman of the Department of English at the University of Michigan, long argued for Ph.D. programs and dissertations in English based upon the recognition that the degree is a *professional* degree for college scholar-*teachers*, and especially by the

---

[23] *Addresses and Proceedings of the NEA*, (1912), p. 759.

NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged. This question of relevance underlies the rationale and specificity of recommendations in the present Guidelines. This concern about the nature of preparation led the officers of the new NCTE to appoint one of its first committees to find out just what kind of college preparation teachers of English in high schools had had. Its study of the reports submitted by 450 teachers was published in the *English Journal*, May 1915.[24]

THE growing dissatisfaction with the influence of colleges upon high school programs, making them too restrictive and irrelevant for many, if not most, students, a dissatisfaction which led to the founding of the NCTE, also led to the appointment in 1912 or 1913 of one of the most important committees in the development of secondary education: the National Joint Committee on the Reorganization of English in the High Schools. The members represented the newly-formed committee of the NCTE on types of organization of high school English programs and the NEA Committee on College-Entrance Requirements in English. Of special importance to the Council's role is that James Fleming Hosic, one of the founders of the Council, its first Secretary-Treasurer, founder of the *English Journal*, and later president, was appointed chairman of this joint committee. The Committee's point of view and progress reports were presented at the NEA meetings in 1913, 1914, and 1915. According to the reports of those meetings, the hundreds of representative supervisors, principals and teachers from all over the country—people knowledgeable about public schools and their English programs—enthusiastically endorsed the work of the Committee.[25]

Although the Committee's *Report*, often called the "Hosic Report," is best known for the recommendations for reorganizing English programs in public secondary schools, the Committee also offered comments upon and recommendations for the preparation of teachers. It recognized the main facts the NCTE had reported on the preparation of high school teachers of English, but it also agreed with that committee's conclusion "that as yet the question as to what constitutes the best preparation for the English teacher has not been widely or thoroughly considered."

In two statements expressing its point of view, the Committee focuses attention upon the importance of the quality of teachers:

> 11. Finally, the success of English work is conditioned by certain material and personal factors, the most important of which are the number and size of classes, the library and other equipment, and the preparation of the teacher. . . .
> 13. The supreme essential to success in high-school English is the trained teacher—the teacher trained by the study of his subject, by the study of educational principles and methods, and trained by experience. The novice and the itinerant—often one and the same—are the chief stumbling blocks to progress in English as in other fields. They must give way to the professional imbued with the sympathetic spirit. Such a person will have rational standards, mature judgment, and definite methods of measurement.[26]

Most of the report is an early textbook on methods of teaching English in secondary schools relevant to the Committee's point of view and program. In discussing methods, the Committee states that the "chief problems, materials, methods, all

---

[24] The Committee received 450 replies to 1500 questionnaires. Of these 450 high school teachers of English, 90 per cent had a college degree; 50 per cent specialized in college English, that is, took five or more English courses in college; about 50 per cent had some specialized training in the teaching of English. Those who had had this special training reported that in general they found it helpful. Some of them reported, however, that their other courses in education were too theoretical.

[25] James Fleming Hosic, compiler, *Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools*, Bulletin No. 2. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Office of Education, 1917), p. 28.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

have immediate implications for attitudes of teachers and preparation for teaching,"[27] and later comments upon the "lamentable lack of any true pedagogy of English teaching."[28]

The Joint Committee did not make the needed comprehensive study of what constitutes the best preparation for high school teachers of English. That attempt did not come until the 1960s. But it did comment generally upon the matter and offered two sample programs of what it was talking about. It opens its special section on the preparation of teachers with the following statement about the nature of the act of teaching of English and the implications it saw for the preparation for such teaching:

> The difficulty is that mastery of English does not consist in the learning of facts and rules nor in mere mechanical skill. Communication is an art. . . . It is, indeed, not a task for a mere scholar accustomed to having bodies of facts presented in lecture form from the teacher's desk. It requires knowledge, but also skill—skill in using that knowledge in the guidance of others.[29]

Here the Committee is making somewhat the same kind of distinction that Coulter had made in 1912.

The Committee took from the *English Journal*, May 1916, a description of a program planned by the University of Southern California, which required the candidate to complete four years of college and a graduate year. It provided extensive studies in English, foreign languages, history, public speaking, philosophy, and education, together with a special course in the teaching of high-school English, which would meet for three hours a week throughout the graduate year. At the same time, the candidate would be doing his practice teaching four periods a week and have a course in school management two periods a week.

The Committee also reported some general information about offerings for teachers of English and stipulated what it considered to be essentials:

> Inasmuch as almost all the larger colleges and universities of the country have begun to offer special courses for the training of high school teachers, particularly in their summer sessions, it seems likely that in the near future such courses may become reasonably standardized.

Although the Committee had acknowledged earlier it did not know what "constitutes the best preparation for the teacher of English," it proceeded to do what others have since done: specify what *it* considered indispensable:

> (1) studies in the nature and elements of the various literary types, in addition to a broad reading knowledge of English and American literature, (2) sufficient training in oral and written composition, including public speaking, (3) a course in the application of educational principles to the teaching of English in high school, and (4) active practice under direction. . . . Preliminary steps have been taken in certain states to demand specific professional training of all high school teachers, and it is certain that it is only a question of time until this will be a common practice.[30]

Specialists in English education today might not quarrel with what is included in these recommendations but would question serious omissions when compared with the scope of the ETPS Guidelines, or even with Scott's calling in 1903 for an enlightened attitude toward language, for substantial training in the English language and a foreign language, preparation in the psychology of speech and in the processes through which children acquire their native speech, the ability to write and to teach and evaluate compositions, the study of comparative literature and literary criticism, in addition to studies in English and American literature. Scott's analysis of the

---

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 71.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 147.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

kind of preparation needed is both more penetrating and considerably more forward-looking than are the generalizations offered by Hosic's Committee. But the Joint Committee did introduce a new feature that has gotten a great deal of vigorous attention since the middle of the 1950's: the certification of teachers.

The Committee also included a brief description of a then recently established graduate degree at the University of California that required, in addition to other features, at least four years of professional experience and two full years of graduate study. At least by 1917, patterns of five-year and six-year programs of teacher education resembling some of those today had already been established.

In the light of recent developments in appointing specialists as supervisors of English in several states, another set of recommendations in the section on the preparation of teachers may be of special interest. The Committee included remarks on the inservice education of teachers made by Clarence D. Kingsley, High School Inspector, Massachusetts Board of Education, who advocated the following activities for State directors of high school English:

1. Visit English teachers in their classrooms so as to discuss their individual problems.
2. Confer with groups of teachers regarding common problems.
3. Issue bulletins embodying the results of successful experimentation, giving references to useful materials.
4. Revise from time to time State manuals on the teaching of English.
5. Make arrangements whereby State directors of English could, in alternate years, serve as instructors in institutions preparing teachers of English. In this way, they could bring to the preparation of teachers an intimate knowledge of the needs of the schools, and during the years in which they were acting as field agents they could know what preliminary training the teachers had received.[31]

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

As this 1917 report indicates, the awareness of some possibilities of preservice and inservice programs was expanding. Whereas the Committees of Ten, Twelve, and Fifteen had merely pointed out the need for better teachers in general to implement their programs, Hosic's Committee offered a point of view, policies, recommendations, and sample programs specifically for teachers of English. The report had its greatest impact, however, as the culmination of the widespread revolt against twenty or thirty years of restrictive high school English programs geared mainly to priming students for college admissions examinations. It would be more than a decade before another sizable group of English teachers and professors would develop the point of view of the Hosic Committee into a full-blown English curriculum, kindergarten to graduate school.

But during the intervening years, individual teachers carried on the revolution by showing how the philosophy of the Hosic Committee could be made to work in the day-to-day classroom teaching of English, by pointing out some implications for the preparation of teachers, and by anticipating the next major curriculum development. One was Walter Barnes. At that time, he was head of the English Department at Fairmont State Normal School, Fairmont, West Virginia. He later became Professor of English Education at New York University. He was teacher, author, editor, and lecturer on the teaching of English. Three of his lectures to teachers of English in the schools and colleges in Western Pennsylvania and West Virginia—"Making English Democratic" (1918), "Democratic Ideals of Culture and Efficiency: Their Relation to English" (1919), and "The Palace of Pedagogy" (1920)—were published together in *The New Democracy in the Teaching of English*.[32]

Throughout his lectures, Barnes emphasizes the importance of teachers' attending democratically in the classroom to the wide range of students' characteristics, needs, experiences, abilities, interests. This point of view permeated also the discussions and pa-

[32] (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1923).

pers during the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English held at Dartmouth College in 1966. It is treated in some detail by John Dixon and Herbert J. Muller, authors of two reports on the conference, but particularly by Muller in his second chapter, "Democracy in the Classroom," of his report, *The Uses of English*.[33]

In his lectures, Barnes vigorously attacks what he considered to be the dull, stultifying, largely irrelevant English programs, attitudes, and teaching methods visited upon democratic public high schools by aristocratic colleges and universities. He was, it now seems, an earlier Ben DeMott, a one-man traveling Dartmouth Conference, in his attitudes towards English and the teaching of it.[34] Although we presumably are concerned here with the relevance of Barnes' ideas on the education of teachers of English, we first need a taste of the DeMottian flavor and attitudes toward literature, talk, language, and writing. In talking about the traditional, aristocratic treatment of literature, Barnes says:

> Our favorite blunder is presenting this literature as fine art, to be studied and analyzed as specimens of art, instead of as documents of life, romantic or realistic, to be observed and reflected upon as fragments of existence. . . . Are we taking up a drama of Shakespeare's? Instead of reading rapidly through the play, following the story, and comparing it with life as the children have observed life, getting acquainted with the characters and watching them act and react upon circumstances and upon one another, noting passages of wisdom and eloquence with which the pages of Shakespeare are so generously strewn; instead of treating the play as a cross-section of human existence, we must study the sources of the plot and conjecture why the author modified them, we must learn the architecture of the play, the exposition, rising action, and so forth . . . —all matters of interest to the technician, to the student of the art of stagecraft, to the dwellers of the Palace [of Pedagogy on the Hill], but of no concern to the inhabitants of the plains.[35]

Instead, teachers should see that "Literature is alive as long as it has life, and it has life as long as it influences life," and that "A bit of literature can have no effect upon a child if it makes no appeal to him, if it fails to come home to his heart and bosom."[36] Quite in keeping with the recommendations growing out of the Dartmouth Conference, Barnes in 1918-1920 emphasizes throughout his lectures the importance of talk, the use of English in everyday life, idiomatic speech, the merits of effective, vigorous slang, relating writing to students' personal experiences, the "paramount importance of oral expression."

This is the spirit, the attitude he wanted colleges to help foster in students preparing to teach English. He did not presume to know, however, what English should be taught in colleges and universities. But he believed that some of it should be related to the subject-matter and methods of teaching English in high schools, that future teachers should study modern literature, including fiction and poetry, modern newspapers and magazines, and oral expression in its various forms. It is not the program he asked for in college English departments but the freshness of outlook, the commitment to the acceptance of children as they are, the importance of making all aspects of English relevant to and meaningful in the lives of students—all these qualities now so urgently in demand among teachers today are what recommend Barnes' contributions to the attention of those interested in

---

[33] John Dixon, *Growth Through English* (Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967); Herbert J. Muller, *The Uses of English* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967).

[34] Professor DeMott is chairman of the Department of English, Amherst College. He was a participant in the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English held at Dartmouth. For his inveighing against what he called the traditional "Lit. Hist." and "Lit. Crit." point of view toward the nature of literature and the teaching of it, see his article, "Reading, Writing, Reality, Unreality. . . ." *Educational Record*, (Summer 1967) 197-205.

[35] *The New Democracy in the Teaching of English*, pp. 29-30.

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 8, 17.

preparing students to move into the plains, suburbs, or ghettos to teach English. Barnes also turns up in later developments.

THE stirrings symbolized and accelerated by the 1917 *Report on the Reorganization of English and Secondary Schools* and by individuals such as Walter Barnes created considerable activity among English teachers interested in developing curricular materials and among leaders in the NCTE. Many teachers and administrators engaged in developing materials throughout the 1920's wrote to the NCTE headquarters to request copies of the Council's curricular materials. It had none. As viewed by the Council's leaders, the circumstances seemed to be these:

> The Reorganization Report was of course recommended, but since 1917 the social situation upon which the curriculum should be based had changed materially; the character of the school population, especially in the high school, had changed; the junior high school had grown from an experiment into an accepted institution; educational thinking and general practice had made material advances; more detailed outlines had come into fashion; new materials were available for literature courses; and, most important of all, the Reorganization Report covered only Grades 7-12 whereas any thoroughly effective training in English must be planned from the kindergarten up.[37]

In recognition of these circumstances, the NCTE Executive Committee approved in November 1929, President Ruth Mary Weeks' proposal that a Curriculum Commission be appointed to create an English curriculum to be recommended for use from kindergarten through graduate school. There were two especially significant features of the sponsorship of this ambitious project and of the membership of the Commission. First, President Weeks obtained the support of the following educational organizations; each was represented on the Commission: National Education Association, American Association of Teachers Colleges, National Association of Teachers of Speech, National Association of Journalism Advisers, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Second, the membership of the Commission represented the full range of our educational system and all parts of the country. W. Wilbur Hatfield of the Chicago Normal College, who had succeeded Hosic as Secretary-Treasurer of the NCTE in 1919 and served in this capacity until 1953, was appointed to the chairmanship of the Steering Committee. Throughout the membership of the fifteen committees more than 100 representatives of schools, colleges, and universities worked closely together, thus following in the pattern established by the Committee of Ten in 1892. Of special interest in this account of the English teachers' growing awareness of the importance of the individual student and his experiences as a major basis for an English curriculum is that Walter Barnes, then of New York University, was a member of the Steering Committee and co-chairman with Hatfield of the Secondary Level Committee on Literature.[38]

The publication of *An Experience Curriculum* in 1935 represents in a sense—almost two decades later—a fulfillment of the promise and directives in the Reorganization Report of 1917: a pattern curriculum for English, Grades K through graduate school, based upon the principle that "Experience is the best of all schools" and that school and college curriculums should consist of experiences, that is, "well-selected experiences."[39] The rationale and patterns illustrate how all strands and materials of an English program can be designed to accommodate the wide range of individual differences among students, to capitalize upon experiences in and out of school, and to foster each child's creativity. At a time when apparently an increasing number of American teachers of English are now showing interest in what may seem to many to be points of view and methods of

[37] W. Wilbur Hatfield, *An Experience Curriculum in English*, A Report of the Curriculum Commission of the NCTE (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1935), p. ix.

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. ix-xvi *passim.*

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

teaching English newly fashioned by British teachers of English as reported in the Dartmouth Conference, they should also turn back fifty years to see that in such documents as the 1917 *Report on the Reorganization of English*, the lectures by Barnes, and particularly *An Experience Curriculum* much that may now seem quite revolutionary coming out of Dartmouth had been put before us long ago.

BUT somehow many of us, especially the opinion-makers among us, seemed to have lost or discredited this sense of direction—until this current convergence of exciting, sensible ideas imported from the British largely through the Dartmouth Conference and of our own sudden, jolting realization that much of what we have been doing in our English classes simply is no longer relevant for today's youth. Perhaps we lost the impact of *An Experience Curriculum* because it—and all else—were soon overshadowed by the dreadful substance of World War II. The discrediting followed in the early 1950s, especially as represented by Bestor, Lynd, and the Council on Basic Education.[40] Bestor's title, *Educational Wastelands, The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools*, clearly announces his judgment. He equates an experiential curriculum with anti-intellectualism and a lack of faith in intellectual endeavor and progressive education, as he understands it, with regressive education, and "Life-Adjustment Training" becomes "A Parody of Education." He then presents his own program for the "Reorganization of Teacher Training" in which he recommends practically abolishing work in professional education with the exception of supervised teaching. However, he also chides academic departments for not taking a more active part in preparing teachers. Lynd also tries to annihilate "Educationists" and "Educationism" for their role in perpetuating quackery in public schools. Today, however, some academicians, particularly those who participated in the Dartmouth Conference, applaud and popularize the recent rediscovery of the importance of students' experiences, imagination, creativity, and the efforts to make English relevant—right now. They seem to think of this present form of an experience curriculum, however, not as a return to concepts of progressive education but rather as a "humanitarian" education.[41]

But perhaps another factor may also have contributed to the loss of the significance and momentum the experienced curriculum symbolized: an unfortunate weakness in what should have been one of the report's most important sections but one that apparently was and still is overlooked—"Teacher Education in English," buried in Appendix C, last in the book.

If the Commission had hoped to prepare and inspire succeeding generations of English teachers to understand, try out, evaluate, and improve a curriculum based upon selected experiences, then surely it could have given teacher education a much more prominent role in the future of the curriculum. Maybe, too, it should have applied more fully the pattern strands. Although strands of students' experiences are explicitly developed and illustrated from kindergarten on into college, they are virtually ignored in the program of teacher education offered in the modest section at the close of the volume.

The Committee on Teacher Training introduces its program by properly stressing the importance of some criteria for the careful selection of students preparing

---

[40] Arthur E. Bestor, *Educational Wastelands, The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools* (Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1953).

Albert Lynd, *Quackery in the Public Schools* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1953).

James R. Koerner, ed., *The Case for Basic Education* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1961).

[41] For an analysis of these differences see James E. Miller, Jr., "Literature in the Revitalized Curriculum," *The English Curriculum in the Secondary School, The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, Number 318, April 1967. Professor Miller was a participant in the Dartmouth Conference. In reviewing four stages of the development of the curriculum, he says, in part: "We are now, in my view, on the threshold of the fourth stage, which I call the Humanitarian. . . . [It] is and will continue to be radically different from the Progressive stage before it" (p. 26).

to become teachers of English. And it also emphasizes the importance of an experience curriculum within the program of teacher education, but for the *candidate*: he should have such experiences as "travel, field work, case studies, research, journalistic and literary publications, dramatics, pageantry, dance drama, puppetry," and culminating, of course, in practice teaching or internship.[42]

Then the Committee presents somewhat detailed descriptions of realistic programs for the preparation of teachers for elementary schools, for those preparing to teach English in junior and senior high schools, and for those intending to use English as a teaching minor or supporting subject, all extending for at least four years and some for five. Each is designed to help the candidate improve his ability to speak, write, read, and to read aloud and interpret effectively literary selections; increase his knowledge of a wide range of literature, including literature for children or adolescents, contemporary literature, myths, legends, sacred writings, world literature, as well as English and American, literary criticism, and of objective studies of students' reading development that will help the teacher select and teach literature and stimulate the individual's reading interests accordingly; and acquire the ability to teach a variety of reading skills. In addition, those interested in teaching in secondary schools should have courses in advanced composition, including creative writing, history of the English language, including current usage problems and an interpretation of Leonard's *Current English Usage*,[43] and present day grammar. The professional preparation should be built around supervised teaching but also include methods of remedial teaching and a course in special materials and methods of teaching various components of English.

The practical programs outlined in this volume closely resemble those in use today, perhaps are superior to some. They are quite in keeping with recommendations in the ETPS Guidelines. Good as they are, however, they also reveal a major weakness, at least as described in the report. Their product still might not be prepared to implement in his teaching and associations with children the principles and procedures essential to a curriculum based upon students' experiences. The only kinds of experiences even mentioned throughout this section on teacher education are those of the candidate himself. There is no explicit directive to college faculties about the importance of their accepting the centrality of students' experiences as a major factor in their learning. Nothing is said about the importance of the candidate's knowing about *An Experience Curriculum* and about his learning how to identify and capitalize upon students' experiences during his experiences in working with case studies and in observations, field work, supervised teaching, and, later, inservice education.

Apparently the Committee on Teacher Training and, presumably, the entire Commission had merely assumed that the merits of the experiential curriculum were sufficiently self-evident that college faculties, future teachers, and supervisors of directed teaching would, of course, automatically mine the gold therein. Perhaps too few did. Perhaps too much had been assumed. And perhaps also herein lies a warning to the organizations sponsoring the present Guidelines not to assume that now they are readily available to everyone the values of the suggestions are self-evident enough to recommend themselves immediately to institutions preparing teachers of English, to state certifying agencies, and to districts offering programs of inservice education.

IN the decade following the publication of *An Experience Curriculum*, many individuals published reports of studies of varying scope. The most ambitious were those conducted by Dora V. Smith of the University of Minnesota and President of the NCTE in 1936-37. Throughout much of the 1930s she was engaged in significant research into the teaching of English in public elementary and secondary schools. She reported her findings and evaluations in three volumes.[44] From these investiga-

[42] *An Experience Curriculum*, pp. 312-315, *passim*.

[43] Sterling Andrus Leonard, *Current English Usage* (Chicago: NCTE, 1932).

[44] *Instruction in English*, Monograph No. 20 of the National Survey of Secondary Education,

tions, especially from her visits to numerous classrooms and her inquiries into programs of teacher education, she extracted implications for the preparation of teachers of English. These she reported in two articles. In the first, "The Academic Training of High-School Teachers of English,"[45] she recommends that the future teacher have strong preparation in liberal arts: history, "as wide range of natural science as possible," appreciation of music and art, and an understanding of basic questions in social sciences and geography. More closely related to his teaching field is training in speech, oral interpretation of literature, in the use of major reference sources in libraries and classification of books and other materials, journalism, and dramatic arts. She recommends within the English major studies in the "major contributions of English, American, and in certain instances, world literature, taught sometimes by types, sometimes by theme, and sometimes by chronology," contemporary literature, informative prose, literature for adolescents, and the historical development of the English language, showing the "inevitability of linguistic change." She pleads for a sense of reality throughout this program and for a five-year program of teacher education.

The following lengthy quotation taken from Professor Smith's report on the "Implications of the New York Regents' Inquiry for the Teaching of English" is presented here because in it she points out the relationships between the needs of teachers of English as she saw them in her visits to their classes and in talking with them and the preparation then offered by colleges and universities in New York State. This question of relevance was also a part of the inquiry made some twenty years later by the NCTE Committee on National Interest in preparing its report, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*.[46] The same questions will inevitably arise in applying the Guidelines to programs throughout the country.

> [The New York State Syllabus in English] presupposes training on the part of English teachers in written composition, oral expression, and usage, including trends in the historical development of the English language. In reading, it requires a general knowledge of English and American literature, with emphasis upon type rather than chronology, and upon recent centuries rather than pre-Shakespearean periods. It assumes on the part of teachers a wide reading of all types of literature, including biography and informative prose of recent decades. In addition, it requires acquaintance with the best books available for adolescents, knowledge of current magazines and newspapers, and understanding of library techniques and reference sources useful at the high school level.
>
> Comparison of these needs with the teaching-training programs in eleven colleges and universities training 65 per cent of the English teachers in the high schools visited reveals an urgent need for reconsideration of the whole problem of teacher-training in terms of the requirements of the secondary school. Only two of the eleven institutions require a course in speech of prospective teachers of English. Cornell University offers a course in oral expression for teachers, recognizing the importance of voice control, tone quality, and articulation for those who would guide pupils in the classroom, and taking into account the social aspects of speech emphasized in *An Experience Curriculum*. Courses in the history of the English language are offered in eight out of eleven institutions but are required in only one. Whether these deal with the inevitability of linguistic change and acceptable standards in current usage it is

---

Bulletin No. 17, 1932 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office). New York Regents' Inquiry into the Character and Cost of Public Education, *Evaluating Instruction in English in the Elementary Schools*, by Dora V. Smith (National Conference on Research in English, Research Bulletin No. 8, 1941). New York Regents' Inquiry into the Character and Cost of Public Education, *Evaluating Instruction in Secondary School English*, by Dora V. Smith (English Monograph No. 11, National Council of Teachers of English, 1941).

[45] *Harvard Educational Review*, (March 1938).

[46] (Champaign: NCTE, 1961).

impossible to tell. The largest portion of the English major requirements for degrees in New York State is devoted to literature. The emphasis is upon chronology rather than upon type, and the content is English and traditional to the exclusion of the American and the contemporary. Fewer than one-third of the institutions require a course in American literature of prospective teachers of high school English. Two offer no course in the American field. Five, however, present certain courses in literary types which undoubtedly include both English and American material. No institution requires work in contemporary literature, and only one a course in adolescent literature and library reference for high schools. The seriousness of the problem may be illustrated by the fact that one college which trains approximately one-half of the English teachers in the schools visited in a great city system requires a twenty-four credit major in English, nine of which must be in Anglo-Saxon and Middle English, and none at all in speech, contemporary literature, American literature, or books for adolescents. Is it any wonder that studies of the voluntary reading of high school pupils bring discouraging results? In contrast to this is the program being developed at the University of Syracuse, which patterns its courses rather directly upon the needs of the high school teacher in the state and the nature of the cultural influence it is desirable that he or she exert in the community. [This program was designed by Professor Helene Hartley. Her ideas on the preparation of teachers of English will be discussed later.]

In this connection I am concerned, as a member of a teacher-training staff, with the fact that much of the poorest, most old-fashioned teaching in the New York schools is being done by the graduate but one or two years removed from the training college, where he has in many instances been taught better modes of procedure. The conditions surrounding teaching in the large cities are being studied by local and national groups. Those surrounding the young, inexperienced teacher almost totally without supervision in the field may well challenge the attention of organizations like ours [NCTE].[47]

In her report, *Evaluating Instruction in Secondary School English* (1941), Professor Smith mentions some other inadequacies among teachers she thought should be brought to the attention of institutions preparing teachers. Because she found that many of them were unaware of the results of research related to the very teaching problems they were encountering, she states that "It is imperative, if mere personal argument is to be superseded by a scientific approach to the problems of curriculum making and instruction in English, that teachers be acquainted during their preservice training with the major findings of research in their own field."[48] She also found only one out of ten of all the English teachers she worked with in this study had read *An Experience Curriculum,* an official publication of the NCTE which she claimed had done "more than any other single volume to stimulate thought concerning practices in teaching English throughout the country."[49]

PROFESSOR Smith's comments about college English requirements in the 1930s might be compared to results obtained in 1960 from 454 institutions by the NCTE Committee on National Interest in its study of programs for preparing teachers of English in secondary schools. Some encouraging changes in college requirements had occurred during the twenty-two years but not as much as might be hoped for. The Committee found that 86.8 per cent of the institutions required a survey of English literature; 83.7 per cent required a survey of American literature, a substantial increase over what Miss Smith had found in New York State; 37 per cent, a survey of

---

[47] *English Journal,* 28 (March 1939) 188. This article is also included in Dora V. Smith, *Selected Essays* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), pp. 317-336.

[48] *Evaluating Instruction in Secondary School English, op. cit.,* p. 257.

[49] *Ibid.,* p. 216.

world literature. Although the number is still low, the 21.1 per cent requiring courses in contemporary literature, 29.1 per cent, a course in literary criticism, 38.8 per cent courses in literary types, and 15.9 per cent, courses in literature for adolescents, 41 per cent, a course in advanced composition, and 17.4 per cent, a course in modern English grammar[50]—all these percentages represent some gains in requirements for future teachers over those of the 1930s. Yet the Committee found that much work has to be done to give more reality to programs for preparing teachers of English. Echoing Miss Smith's remarks of two decades earlier, the Committee states that still

> The most notable deficiencies [in the preparation to teach literature] are in the areas of world literature and contemporary literature and in the apparent indifference of colleges to educating teachers in methods of literary criticism. The overwhelming majority of colleges do not require a course in literature for adolescents. Although students may elect work of these kinds in most institutions, the absence of any widely held requirements suggests that existing programs in teacher education tend to neglect preparation in these areas.[51]

The chances for more accelerated improvements in the near future, however, should be somewhat better. The ETPS Guidelines not only exist, but they also represent a consensus of a wide cross-section of the profession. The specific recommendations related to what goes into courses offer a means of looking behind course numbers and titles to see just how relevant the concepts, content, and procedures are for future teachers. Furthermore, the Guidelines are endorsed by MLA, NCTE and by the representatives of both organizations who may be in the most strategic position of all to put the Guidelines to work in English courses, the departmental chairmen who are members of the Association of Departments of English. And now a new group of participants has been introduced: the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. It could be that English departments preparing teachers may have some difficulties in overlooking the Guidelines from now on.

But whether these marshalled forces equipped with shining new Guidelines will actually bring about recommended changes that will surface in future surveys and thereby show that colleges and universities have taken seriously the realities of preparing teachers of English may depend in part upon the whole enterprise's finding answers to questions posed by Dora V. Smith thirty years ago. How do the requirements and options in preservice programs relate to the realities of teaching English in the varieties of schools and communities? How are changes brought about in programs that are largely irrelevant to the kinds of teaching called for in the schools?[52] What can be done to acquaint teachers with the results of respectable research in their own fields and then help them use the results in their teaching? How can we stimulate teachers to continue to read the professional literature in their field? How can institutions and school districts help teachers keep from returning to outmoded concepts, materials, and methods of teaching soon after they have completed their preservice preparation?[53]

---

[50] *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, pp. 60, 81, 82, 84 *passim*.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[52] In 1967, Professor Harold B. Allen, University of Minnesota, provided the profession with an outstanding example of how such changes might be brought about. He planned and conducted a series of meetings for representatives of all the colleges and universities in Minnesota engaged in preparing teachers of English to acquaint them with the Guidelines and their use in these institutions.

[53] This observation made by Dora V. Smith was later investigated by Professor Alice Scofield of San Jose State College. Through her study of the teaching methods used by about one hundred teachers of English who were completing their first five years of teaching, Mrs. Scofield found that many of these teachers tended to use methods generally disapproved of by specialists in English Education. For more information on this study see Alice Fulmor Gill Scofield, *The Relationship Between Some Methods of Teaching Language Arts as Advocated in Methods Courses and as*

THE research and extensive writing accomplished by Professor Smith during the 1930s and early 1940s actually constitute a benchmark in the development of programs for the education of teachers of English. These notable achievements, her many other contributions to the profession, and her admirable personal qualities indicate very clearly why the Executive Committee of the NCTE unanimously chose her to be the Director of a new Commission on the English Curriculum established in 1945.

Thus began the most ambitious curriculum project yet undertaken by the Council. The representation among the thirty-one members of the Commission and the 175 members of its committees followed the pattern established in 1892 by Eliot's Committee of Ten and the ninety members of its nine Conferences: the full range of our educational system, including one college president, and all parts of the country. According to the Director, "In addition, more than three hundred and fifty school systems in the course of the study borrowed and tried out materials and contributed examples from their own system."[54] The Executive Committee asked the Commission "to examine the place of the language arts in life today, to examine the needs and methods of learning for children and youth, and to prepare a series of volumes on the English curriculum based on sound democratic principles and the most adequate research concerning how powers in the language arts can best be developed."[55] To fulfill this charge, the Commission published five volumes known as the Curriculum Series: *The English Language Arts* (1952), *The Language Arts for Today's Children* (1954), *The English Language Arts in the Secondary School* (1956), *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges* (1963), and *The College Teaching of English*.[56] Of direct concern to this report is Volume V, *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges,* which will be discussed later.

A statement that does fit here chronologically, though, was written by a member of the curriculum Commission, Chairman of its Committee on Reading and Literature, and President of the Council in 1945-46, the late Professor Helene W. Hartley of Syracuse University. Under the chairmanship of Max J. Herzberg, member of the Executive Committee and a Past President of the Council, a committee of leaders in the NCTE contributed papers on *The Emerging Curriculum in English in the Secondary School,* which constitute the entire issue of *The Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, February 1946. Miss Hartley's paper is on "The Preparation and Selection of Teachers of English," in which she discusses aspects of academic preparation and related personal attributes.

She bases the criteria for selecting future teachers of English and for planning an appropriate program upon what a teacher of English is expected to do in the "emerging high school." It will be recalled that in her report on the Regents' Inquiry Dora V. Smith commended Professor Hartley's program at Syracuse for being closely related to the realities of teaching English in public schools. Professor Hartley states that the *kind* of English major offered a candidate is more important than the *fact* that he has a major. She, too, criticizes majors that consist almost entirely of courses in literature. Literature there must be, of course. She recommends including studies of "carefully chosen masterpieces of the great literatures of the world . . ." as well as English, American, and contemporary. To help the future teacher guide students' reading of literature he should have read widely and continue to read, should be able to read aloud effectively, and should be able to teach reading skills.

Among the essentials of his preparation as a teacher of speaking and writing, he should of course be able to speak and write effectively and should be prepared to give much more attention to oral communication

---

Practiced in the Classroom. Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation (Palo Alto: Stanford School of Education, 1955).

[54] The Commission on the English Curriculum, *The English Language Arts* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952), p. viii.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. vii.

[56] All were published for the Council by Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., New York.

in his classes then is generally the case in English classes. And his experiences and preparation in writing should include the more creative as well as expository modes and should help him develop a genuine interest in fostering individual pupil's creativeness. Her emphasis upon the importance of oral communication and creative writing is in keeping with a plea that began at least as long ago as President Eliot, and that has been greatly strengthened by recommendations from Hosic's Joint Committee, Barnes, contributors to *An Experience Curriculum,* and the Dartmouth reports. She also describes in some detail the kind of preparation the teacher should have in the nature of language, the history and structure of the English language, and modern concepts of usage and semantics. Although interest in the importance of semantics seemed to have declined for a number of years, it is again on the rise. The re-awakening of awareness of the importance of semantics in the English curriculum was evident also at Dartmouth. Muller begins his own statement of what he believes might be the basis of a language program in secondary schools with this sentence: "The students should acquire some understanding of the nature of denotations and connotations of words."[57]

Professor Hartley was also in keeping with past and present emphasis upon experience. She stresses the importance of the experiences surrounding the English teacher and pupils studying a subject "closely bound to the experience of living for its interpretation and significance." She had been a member of the Commission that wrote *An Experience Curriculum.* And throughout the rest of her distinguished career, perhaps culminating in her rich contributions to Volume V of the Curriculum Series, *The Education of Teachers of English* (1963), she continued to strive for improved preparation of teachers of English.

ONE study of the preparation of teachers of English near the close of the 1940s apparently introduced some new features into such inquiries. In 1946-47, a subcommittee of the Committee to Study English Curricula in the California Educational System surveyed programs offered by fifteen of the eighteen institutions then accredited to prepare teachers of English for secondary schools.

The Committee inquired about the usual components of programs: general education, teaching major and minor, and professional education. But through its questionnaire supplemented by interviews with faculty and students on eleven of the campuses, it also looked into the question of balance in the preparation in composition, grammar, literature, speech, dramatics, journalism; the proportion of the preparation in general education, major and minor, and professional education; the effectiveness of cooperation between the faculty in English and those in Education; the educational training and teaching experiences of faculty preparing teachers, particularly those teaching methods courses and supervising directed teaching; and whether prospective teachers were getting any experience in working with homogeneous and heterogeneous classes and with small groups within classes, in considering the advantages and disadvantages of various kinds of grouping, and in selecting, organizing, and presenting materials and activities appropriately to accommodate abilities and needs of individual pupils.

The committee found that, contrary to common criticisms of the supposed excessive imbalance of preparation in favor of professional education, about 30 to 40 per cent was devoted to general education, about the same percentage to the teaching major and minor and related subjects, about 13 to 15 per cent to professional education, and the rest to electives. In short, approximately 85 per cent of these five-year programs was devoted to general education and the academic major and minor and related subjects.

In its report, the committee offered recommendations on arrangements for and supervision of directed observations followed by directed teaching, aspects of courses in methods of teaching English in secondary schools, on how the departments of English and Education can strengthen their contributions to the education of teachers, and proposed some questions—perhaps they would be called guidelines today—that might be used as a means of a de-

[57] *The Uses of English,* p. 72.

partment's evaluating aspects of its program.[58] All of these matters and many others were taken up in considerable detail in Volume V of the NCTE Curriculum Series.

Charles Willard and John D. Mees made a different kind of informative study in Illinois of teachers of English and their recommendations for improving programs of teacher education.[59] The teachers recommended such courses as practical instruction in methods of teaching English in secondary schools, including the teaching of reading; supervised teaching; modern English grammar and usage; advanced composition; contemporary literature; literature for adolescents; and foundations of psychology. These recommendations and those emerging from Shirley M. Carriar's study of problems encountered by beginning teachers[60] reinforce the contributions that can be made by a program of teacher education designed somewhat in recognition of the realities of teaching English in public schools.

FROM that period on, many individual statements and proposals and reports prepared by groups appeared and continue to do so. Valuable references to the wealth of publications are the bibliographies prepared annually by the NCTE Committee on the Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English. Professor Autrey Nell Wiley is chairman and editor of the original bibliography and the annual supplements published in *College English*.[61] The preparation of this bibliography is a great service to the profession. Regrettably, it has not been possible to review and incorporate in this brief account many of the references in these bibliographies.

The activities of this Committee involved its members deeply with an aspect of preparing teachers that so far had received only passing attention: the standards of certification. It had been mentioned in the Hosic report in 1917. But it did not get the vigorous attention it deserved until the middle of the 1950s. One early indication of an awareness of its importance and of problems created by the wide variations in standards from the meaningless to the respectable can be found in the report, "The English Language in American Education," written by Thomas Clark Pollock for a special committee of the Modern Language Association's Commission on Trends in Education. It was first published in 1945 and later appeared in *PLMA*, February 1951. Speaking for the special committee about the inadequacy of some states' certification requirements in the 1940s, Pollock reports that:

> Some states require only six semester-hours in college English, some require as many as thirty semester-hours; some require of the prospective English teacher no college hours or courses in English at all. In general, the requirements are inadequate in at least three ways. First, they do not provide adequate *qualitative* standards of selection. . . . Second, the quantitative standards they set up are usually inadequate. The average requirement is much below the minimum for a college major in English. Third, they usually make no distinction between the various kinds of college courses in English.
>
> We therefore recommend that certification requirements for teachers of English include provision for a quality of work high enough to indicate probable mastery of the subject matter studied; quantitative standards, in terms of se-

---

[58] Alfred H. Grommon, "The Training of Teachers of English for the Secondary Schools of California," *The Educational Forum*, 12 (November 1947) 87-102.

[59] "A Study of the Present Teachers of English in Illinois and Their Recommendations for an Improved Program," *Illinois Bulletin*, 41 (May 1954) 8.

[60] *Instructional Problems of Beginning English Teachers in Colorado, 1956-57*, Unpublished Doctor's Field Study, (Greeley, Colorado: Colorado State College, 1958).

[61] Autrey Nell Wiley, ed., *The Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English, A Bibliography* (1950-1956). (Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English).

———, "The Preparation and Certification of Teachers of English: 1958 Supplement to *A Bibliography (1950-1956)*," *College English*, 21 (April 1960) pp. 379-383. A supplementary bibliography has been published in *College English* each year since.

> mester-hours or some other index of exposure to learning, high enough to indicate that the prospective teacher has had a fair opportunity to master the subject; and analytical standards which will require, not only that the prospective teacher has had work in a college department of English, but also that he has had the type of study which we have indicated as necessary for a properly qualified teacher of the English language. Whenever possible an examination which tests ability and mastery rather than the amount of time previously spent in learning should be substituted for formal course requirements.[62]

In the middle of the 1950s, Donald R. Tuttle, then Professor of English at Fenn College in Cleveland and now Chief of the English Section in the U.S. Office of Education; Eugene E. Slaughter, Chairman of the Department of English, Southeastern State College, Durand, Oklahoma, and previously Director of Language Institutes Branch, U.S. Office of Education; and John H. Fisher, then Professor of English, Indiana University, and now Executive Secretary of MLA, became disturbed over these variations in standards for the certification of teachers of English. Professor Tuttle worked tirelessly throughout the State of Ohio to win support for his campaign to persuade the state officials to increase certification requirements for teachers of English. Coupled with this problem was and, to some extent, still is the undesirable administrative practice of assigning English classes to teachers unprepared to teach English.[63] Fisher and Slaughter made extensive biennial surveys of all states' requirements for teachers of English. In reports of follow-up surveys, Fisher analyzed discernible trends in requirements. During the period of these surveys, 1954-1960, appreciable increases were made in the number of credits needed for certification to teach English.[64] Although some requirements were still indefensibly low, many states had increased their requirements considerably, and all are far above the weakest Pollock reported in the 1940s. Many states are working with specialists in subject matter and in education to establish reasonable standards for certification.

Further evidence of this growing concern in the last half of the decade can be seen in the 1955 annual meeting of the Council on Cooperation in Teacher Education at which a group discussed what may have seemed like a surprising topic: "The Learned Societies and the Crisis in Teacher Supply and Preparation." Shortly thereafter, the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, generally called TEPS, organized three national conferences involving representatives of about sixty organizations, not only of professional educators and state officials responsible for certification but also of academicians in a wide range of subject-matter fields, including representatives of MLA, NCTE, the College English Association, and the American Council of Learned Societies. At these national meetings, representatives discussed the full range of problems of selecting, preparing, and certifying teachers for public schools. Four reports were published.[65] In a single follow-up volume, *The Education of Teachers,*

---

[62] George Winchester Stone, Jr., ed., *Issues, Problems, & Approaches in the Teaching of English* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961), pp. 156-157.

[63] Donald R. Tuttle, "A Professional Teacher of English for Every American Student," *College English,* 19 (November 1958) 87-91. Additional studies of the assignment of teachers of English classes can be found in *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges,* pp. 166-169. For a more recent study in Wisconsin see Ruth E. Falk and Robert C. Pooley, "A Survey of Teachers of English in the State of Wisconsin," *Wisconsin Council of Teachers of English,* Special Bulletin, No. 12, September 1965.

[64] John H. Fisher, "Certification of High School Teachers," *College English,* 22 (January 1961) 271-275. For detailed information about requirements in 1954 and 1957, see Fisher's reports in *College English,* 16 (March 1955) 362-365; and 19 (May 1958) 344-348.

[65] National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. *The Education of Teachers: New Perspectives; Official Report of the Second Bowling Green Conference.* (Washington: National Education Association, 1958).

———. *The Education of Teachers: Curriculum Programs. Official Report of the Kansas Conference.* (Washington: N.E.A., 1959).

Conflict and Consensus, G. K. Hodenfield, Education Writer for the Associated Press, who reported each of the national conferences, and T. M. Stinnett, Executive Secretary, NCTEPS, who "added only technical materials," reviewed and analyzed the papers, discussions, and reports.[66] Although this report contains little on the preparation of teachers of English, it does convey the purpose of these important conferences conjoining the academicians and educationists and contributed greatly to the movement toward using specialists in academic disciplines as consultants to state departments of education on matters related to the certification of teachers. Two programs for the preparation of teachers of English for secondary schools, however, are reported in some detail: Fenn College, Cleveland, pp. 70-72; and Stanford University, pp. 89-91. These shortened versions are based upon more complete descriptions in *Curriculum Programs*, the report of the Kansas Conference.

One of the cosponsoring organizations for the TEPS Conferences was NASDTEC (National Association of State Directors of Teachers Education and Certification). Perhaps in the course of these conferences involving NASDTEC working together with representatives of such academic fields as mathematics, biology, modern languages, and English may be found the origins of the projects leading to the development of the guidelines for the education and certification of teachers of mathematics, science, modern foreign languages, and now English. During the decade, 1955-1965, a good deal of educational ecumenicism developed among members of college departments of English and other disciplines, state departments of education and their certifying officers, learned and professional societies, departments and schools of education, the U.S. Office of Education, and in some cases—as in English—among the key organizations within the field.

THIS last is exemplified by the Conference on the Basic Issues in the Teaching of English held throughout 1958. Twenty-eight representatives of the American Studies Association, the College English Association, the Modern Language Association, and the NCTE met in three three-day sessions to identify what they considered to be the basic issues in the teaching of English throughout the schools, colleges, and universities. The group identified twenty-one basic issues related to goals, content, and problems of teaching English, and fourteen in the preparation and certification of teachers. The report, *The Basic Issues in the Teaching of English*, was published as a supplement to *English Journal*, September 1959.

The following issues in the preparation and certification of teachers for the elementary and secondary schools are identified:

22. How much and what kind of training in English should the elementary school teacher have?
23. What skills should an elementary school teacher have in order to develop eagerness in pupils to learn to read and write well?
24. How much of the teacher's training should be in education courses and how much in courses primarily devoted to language and literature?
25. Ideally, how much college study of language and literature is desirable for the secondary school teacher?
26. What standard qualifications in English can be established for secondary school English teachers?
27. What is the responsibility of liberal arts colleges in the preparation of effective teachers of English?
28. What kind of training in teaching methods does the future secondary school English teacher need?
29. How can the Master of Arts degree be made more effective in the preparation of secondary school teachers?
33. How can we achieve articulation

———. *The Education of Teachers: Certification. Official Report of the San Diego Conference.* (Washington: N.E.A., 1960).

———. *New Horizons for the Teaching Profession.* (Washington: N.E.A., 1961).

[66] (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., A Spectrum Book, 1961).

of teaching and teacher training at all levels in English.[67]

34. How can opportunities be made for continued education and intellectual growth for English teachers on all levels?

The basic issues raised by the conference are not new, of course. As perhaps this review has already shown, many of them have concerned people in this field since at least the beginning of this century. But the crystallization of these persistent problems and the detailed questions and comments delineating each issue by representatives of the key organizations symbolizing the profession of teaching of English—at all educational levels—is of utmost significance. This list serves the profession as a convenient, stimulating inventory of where we are and as an inescapable directive on the business before it.

One direct follow-up of the Conference on the Basic Issues was the publishing of a volume of selections on *Issues, Problems, & Approaches in the Teaching of English.*[68] Part I, "Issues & Problems," includes the report on the Conference. The bulk of the book consists of selections on the major aspects of English that had been published since 1900 as chapters of books, sections of reports, or as separate essays. But of immediate concern here is Part IV, "A Program for Action." It includes "An Articulated English Program: A Hypothesis to Test," which developed out of the discussions of the basic issues. One of the hypotheses to be tested is related to the preparation of teachers of English. This one-page statement, like the more extended discussion of teacher education in *An Experience Curriculum,* is placed at the end of the book.

Some of the specifications are in keeping with recommendations made elsewhere: elementary school teachers should have a minor in English, courses in children's literature which includes myths, folk tales, courses in the teaching of reading and of writing, and an advanced course in writing; secondary teachers should also have an advanced course in writing, much literature, including a study of myth, folklore, fairy tales, Biblical lore, a "sound English major, of the comprehensive type," an M.A. in English, work in literary criticism, literary backgrounds, linguistics, and the teaching of writing."[69]

Of special interest is the emphasis upon all English teachers' having a "thorough knowledge of . . . the process of writing." This emphasis in 1961 is surprising but welcomed. Nothing more is said about just what that "process" is. Since then, however, illuminating, stimulating materials have been developed in the Northwestern University Curriculum Study Center, directed by Wallace W. Douglas. This Center and teachers in the cooperating schools have attempted to identify somewhat specifically what the steps in the process of writing seem to be and what teachers and students can do to shift the focus away from the end product of the writing assignment to the whole process by which one tries to write.

Anyone reading the Report on the Basic Issues Conference and this one-page directive on teacher education might have difficulty reconciling the two documents. Whereas the Basic Issues Report is invested with the spirit of cooperative inquiry and discovery, the statement on teacher education is charged with stern attitudes and harsh language. There is much demanding of thoroughness and of furnishing young minds. There is the chilling statement that some of the teachers' problems "derive from the sterility of their continuing professional and intellectual development." And the piece closes with the condescending suggestion that departments of English in liberal arts colleges help

---

[67] In this section, the Advanced Placement Program is cited as one example that articulation is occurring. For a discussion of some implications the growth of the APP may have for the preparation of teachers of English, see Alfred H. Grommon, "The Advanced Placement Program's Implications for the Preparation of Teachers of English," *College English,* 21 (April 1960) 373-378.

[68] *Op. cit.* Edited by George Winchester Stone, Jr., who, then Executive Secretary of MLA, had been a participant in the Basic Issues Conference, and is now Professor of English, New York University.

[69] *Ibid.,* p. 243.

English departments in "teachers colleges" improve their programs. And yet the recommendations are said to have been "drawn from 120 pages of the minutes of the four conferences held on the basic issues."[70]

UNQUESTIONABLY the most important development in this field in 1961 was the publication of the National Council's daring, revealing, influential document, *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, A Report on the Status of the Profession, written by a special Committee on National Interest. The report was prepared to fulfill a resolution adopted at the 1960 convention of the Council calling upon the Executive Committee to do all it could to gain support for the teaching of English, to inform the "nation's leaders in government, business, and education" of the neglect of English in "current educational efforts, and, most pressing, to try to persuade the Congress to extend the NDEA of 1958 to include English and the humanities as a vital first step toward improving instruction in English and of stimulating program development in this important area."

The report boldly announces to the public the rather general inadequacy of the preparation of even the English majors teaching English in the schools and that about half of the teachers assigned English classes in secondary schools in 1959-1960 had not completed an English major in college. The details of these findings can be found in the report.

But of special relevance here in tracing the prelude to the ETPS Guidelines is "A Standard of Preparation to Teach English,"[71] developed initially by the NCTE Committee on Preparation and Certification of Teachers. In a sense, this outline is a skeletal precursor to the more detailed Guidelines. The Committee introduces the outline with an overall statement about the teacher's personal qualities, the balanced nature of his general education, "including knowledge of a foreign language and a basic grounding in science, mathematics, the social sciences, and the arts," preparation in psychology and professional education, and his being a person who "has dedicated himself to humanistic values." The outline specifies the kind of preparation in modern English language and its background, the scope of his preparation in English, American, and world literature, the ability to use a variety of modes of critical analysis, and the kinds of abilities he needs as a teacher to use effectively his knowledge of his subject. Though modest in scope, this outline represents an important first step toward the identification of specific standards.

The flatout effort by the Council's leaders to persuade the Congress to include English and the humanities in the extension and revision of the NDEA failed, but not entirely. By this vigorous campaign, the Executive Committee and the Committee on National Interest informed and awakened the profession to its political responsibilities and to its professional responsibilities in facing up to the facts of the status of the teaching of English and of the urgency of improving both preservice and inservice education of persons assigned to teach English classes. And it eventually led to success in 1964, when English was included in the extension of the Act passed by the Congress.

A development beginning in the summer of 1961 also had far-reaching effects. During three weeks of that summer, sixty instructors selected to staff the CEEB Summer Institutes to be held on twenty campuses in 1962, studied, discussed, haggled over, and planned the three courses to be offered to some 900 high school teachers to be chosen to attend the institutes. These professors of English and a few high school teachers invited to teach in some of the institutes were forced through an "agonizing reappraisal" of what they thought should constitute up-to-date, relevant courses in modern English language, advanced writing, and literature to be presented to carefully selected high school teachers instructing students preparing to attend college. The courses in modern English language and advanced writing were selected to help teachers overcome these serious deficiencies in their preparation as revealed in published surveys. It was hoped,

---

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 235.

[71] *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, pp. 40-42.

of course, that the experiences these English professors had in planning these courses and then later teaching them to experienced teachers of English would make some lasting impact upon them as individuals and subsequently upon their departments' programs for future teachers of English.

The next summer, 868 high school English teachers who generally taught college preparatory students attended the twenty institutes, took the three courses, and in accompanying workshops or seminars led by instructors experienced in teaching English in secondary schools had opportunities to discuss the relationship of the courses to their own classes and to prepare materials appropriate to them. This was a form of strenuous inservice education. Two features of the arrangements were especially sound in assisting the teachers to adapt and apply elements of the institutes' programs to their own classes. First, each candidate had to include with his application a letter from his principal stating that if the teacher were selected to attend the institute, he would be free to apply in his own classes what he thought especially relevant from the institute program. Second, a member of each institute staff was expected during the following fall semester to visit the classes of each teacher who had attended the institute. Here was a sensible program providing a two-way education: the teacher and his students had an opportunity to confer with an English specialist from a college or university; the professor had the sobering, firsthand experience of seeing in the classes of some forty-five teachers what it is really like to teach English to high school students. The triple-level experiences of college faculty in preparing and teaching courses for high school instructors and then of actually going into the trenches during the follow-up visits did indeed make lasting impressions upon some English professors.[72] In some college quarters where it was needed, the prestige of the CEEB lent considerable support to existing college courses in modern English language and to efforts to establish them elsewhere. The institutes and follow-up activities helped to articulate English programs in schools and colleges. And they later served as models for many of the initial NDEA English institutes in 1965.

LATE in 1962 another conference occurred that augurs well for future involvement of college departments of English in preparing teachers. In December, chairmen and representatives of eighty departments of English in colleges and universities throughout the country assembled at the University of Illinois center called Allerton Park, in Monticello, Illinois. The conference was called to discuss research in the teaching of English, especially research related to the U. S. Office of Education program known as "Project English." Important though the considerations of research are, of greater significance here is that the seminar led, first, to the adoption of resolutions stating English departments' responsibilities in the preparation of teachers, and, second, to immediate action on the resolution that the chairmen establish organizations of themselves on "state, regional, and national levels."[73] "These resolutions were approved by unanimous or almost unanimous votes" of the some 80 representatives of all kinds of institutions in all parts of the country. Thus the Association of Departments of English was founded.

In their resolutions, the representatives

---

[72] For information about another conference for college faculty in 1962 on the preparation of English teachers, see *The Academic Preparation of Secondary Teachers*, The Reports of Four Committees of the Twenty-nine College Cooperative Plan (Cambridge: Twenty-nine College Cooperative Plan, 1962). The program of undergraduate courses recommended by professors of English representing five liberal arts colleges and two universities is quite in keeping with recent recommendations in the profession. But the proposals for the teaching of literature as a way of overcoming high school students' indifference and ineptitude regarding the reading of literature are poles apart from the concepts and attitudes expressed by Hosic, Barnes, contributors to *An Experience Curriculum*, and the British and American professors of English participating in the Dartmouth Conference.

[73] "Resolutions Adopted at a Seminar of English Department Chairmen," held at Allerton Park, December 2-4, 1962, *College English*, 24 (March 1963) 473-475.

declared that one of the most important responsibilities of English departments in colleges and universities is to provide both preservice and inservice education for teachers of English. They wisely point out that in fulfilling this commitment departments should "regularly review and evaluate their training programs for teaching assistants and their courses designed for the preparation of high school teachers." Departments now have the widely endorsed ETPS Guidelines to help them test the relevance of their program and specific courses for secondary school teachers much more realistically than they could have envisioned in 1962.

They also recommended that English departments make suitable provisions for qualified experienced teachers who return to take English courses. Teachers denied access to English courses relevant to their interests and needs will be forced thereby to elect courses in other departments, mainly in Education. Although such courses as those in guidance, supervision, administration, psychological and social foundations of education are undoubtedly helpful for educators for whom they are intended, they are a poor substitute indeed for the English teacher who needs a course in modern English language, advanced writing, contemporary literature, or poetry.

The chairmen also emphasized in their resolutions the importance of English departments' expanding "their cooperation with elementary and secondary school teachers of English," offering summer institutes and seminars for them, and, through a national association of departments, coordinating their efforts with those of the MLA, the NCTE, the College English Association, the College Language Association, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, and the American Studies Association. Missing from this list is the Conference on English Education, formed in 1963-64. Had it been in existence in 1962, undoubtedly it, too, would have been included among the professional organizations closely related to purposes of the other groups. In fact, the three or four persons most directly responsible for founding the CEE also participated in the Allerton Park Seminar.

By itself, each of these resolutions and others not mentioned here represents a major advance toward mustering the full resources of all dedicated to the improvement of English instruction. Taken all together, they represent a cohesiveness that should prevent any unfortunate splintering of effort. The cohesiveness is already evident. The close correspondence between some of these resolutions and, on the one hand, the functioning of the CEEB institutes during the preceding year and summer, and, on the other, the Guidelines to be developed three years later should not be surprising. Many of the eighty departmental representatives who drafted the resolutions had helped plan and conduct CEEB institutes and later contributed to the development of the Guidelines.

IN 1963 appeared two especially influential reports: *The Education of American Teachers* by James Bryant Conant[74] and *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges*[75] prepared for the NCTE by the Commission on the English Curriculum as Volume V of the Curriculum Series. Conant, former president of Harvard University, through the vigorous attention he has long been giving to problems of education in this country and overseas, has proved to be a worthy inheritor of the genuine commitment to improving public education exemplified by his illustrious predecessor, Charles William Eliot. Conant and his staff, supported by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, made a two-year investigation of the preparation of teachers for elementary and secondary schools, including certification requirements and practices. During this broad-gauged study, he and his staff also examined, of course, the preparation of elementary school teachers related to their functions as teachers of English and of teachers of English for secondary schools. Conant based his report substantially upon visits he and his staff made to seventy-seven institutions in twenty-two states.

This probe into the preparation and cer-

---

74 (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1963).

75 Alfred H. Grommon, Editor (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1963).

tification of teachers included also an investigation of the "educational establishment" represented, according to Conant, by "organized school administrators, state Department of Education personnel, classroom teachers of various kinds, professors of education, and the executive staffs of such organizations as the School Boards Association and the Parent-Teacher Association."[77] Whereas Fisher and Slaughter were concerned with their investigations into states' quantitative requirements for the certification of teachers of English for secondary schools, Conant inquired also into and analyzed both the educational and political structures of the educational establishment in the several states, the relationships with academic departments in colleges and universities and with the public, and the influence of all this upon the preservice and inservice education of teachers and upon standards and procedures of certification.

This is not the place, however, to analyze and evaluate Conant's many recommendations for altering the educational pattern and certification of teachers. Those of special interest here relate to preparing teachers to teach English. He believes that prospective teachers for elementary and for secondary schools can be adequately prepared in four-year programs.[78]

He takes this stand despite his having been instrumental in establishing at Harvard in 1936 the first M.A.T. program, despite the consistent recommendation by each of the three national TEPS conferences that five years of preparation be required for elementary and secondary school teachers, despite the rapid expansion and development of fifth-year M.A.T. programs nourished by generous funds provided by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, and despite some states' requirements that beginning teachers for secondary schools must first complete a five-year college program. But he does stress the importance of inservice and continuing educational programs and makes excellent, specific recommendations for the kind of "initial probationary period" school boards should provide for new teachers to improve their chances of succeeding as beginners.[79]

He specifies within the four-year program planned for future teachers for elementary schools a substantial two-year, sixty semester-hour program of general education, including a six semester-hour course in the English language and one in the Western world's literary tradition. The rest of the program would consist of a thirty semester-hour concentration in academic subjects and thirty in professional education. He recommends that all students have at least a three-semester-hour course in reading instruction. Those preparing to teach in the kindergarten and the first three grades should have twice this much instruction in the teaching of reading. He offers detailed specifications for these courses. But he also emphasizes the great importance of these students' having at the same time extensive experiences in teaching children to read and in practicing techniques of diagnosis and particularly of remedial teaching.[80]

In his recommendations for preparation in subject-matter fields, Conant distinguishes between the needs of candidates preparing to teach in the lower grades and those preparing for the upper. He believes that those intending to teach in the lower grades should distribute the thirty hours of what would otherwise be a concentration over English, social studies and mathematics, and then some "integrated" courses in the rest of the curriculum in these lower grades. Those preparing to teach in the upper grades should devote the thirty hours to a concentration in English, mathematics, social studies, or science, in addition to related courses in the program of general education. He outlines courses in the teaching of reading and mentions preparation in literature for children. But he does not recommend specifically any courses in

[77] *The Education of American Teachers*, pp. 15-16.

[78] *Ibid.*, pp. 202-3.

[79] *Ibid.*, pp. 70-72. According to Jeremiah Finch, Professor of English, Princeton University, and a member of Conant's staff during this study, some city school systems have now provided some beginning teachers with the kind of probationary arrangements described by Conant. Some internships in fifth-year programs also provide somewhat similar arrangements.

[80] *Ibid.*, pp. 155-157.

speech, dramatics, oral interpretation of literature, and advanced and creative writing. He does advocate, however, experiences working with and teaching children concurrently with courses in child growth and development, teaching of reading, a series of workshops in the content and methods of teaching subjects in the elementary school curriculum, followed by practice teaching. And he describes the qualifications of the kind of clinical faculty he recommends supervise candidates' laboratory experiences and practice teaching in the schools.[81]

For the teacher preparing for secondary schools, he also recommends a program of general education totaling sixty semester hours. He reckons the extent of the academic concentration, however, not so much in course hours as in competence that can somehow be measured by a comprehensive examination. But he does not specify the nature of that examination. The rationale and some possibilities of such an examination in the field of English, are explored in some detail, though, by Wayne C. Booth in his chapter, "The Undergraduate Program," in Volume IV of the NCTE Curriculum Series, *The College Teaching of English* (1964). Booth believes that a kind of consensus already exists among English departments of what a student majoring in English should know and be able to do by the time he completes the program. He presents some speculative criteria based somewhat upon the aforementioned standards for teachers of English. In a vein similar to Conant's, Booth states that "once we shift from coverage to competence, we can begin to make our way with greater assurance among the various programs and devices that a department might or might not develop."[82] Then he presents a sample "Senior Comprehensible Examination," one that might also serve well the purposes Conant has in mind.

Regarding the concentration in English for prospective teachers, Conant said that:

> One might suppose that an adequate major or concentration in English for the A.B. degree in a college with a liberal arts tradition should be more than enough for the high school teacher. Indeed, such a major may provide enough hours of study, but the level of competency in different areas is another matter. On the advice of highly competent persons in the field, I have been persuaded that a future English teacher should have studied not only British and American literature in some depth but also the structure of the English language, and modern grammar; in addition, he should have given some time to familiarizing himself with adolescent literature, with reading problems, with speech and drama, and to composition at the advanced level. Yet many a major in English in our best colleges and universities may have omitted some of these studies. Indeed, the omission may be quite in order if the graduate is not going to be a high school teacher.
>
> Obviously, what is essential is a close cooperation between professors of English and the clinical professor in charge of the methods course and practice teaching. The same is true in every field and needs no further underlining.[83]

The correspondence between these suggestions and those in the Guidelines is obvious. Similarly, the point about the importance of close cooperation between professors of English and the faculty member responsible for courses in methods of teaching English in secondary schools and for supervising the directed teaching done by future English teachers parallels a resolution adopted in 1962 at the Seminar of English Department Chairmen: "Teachers of English education should hold appointments in English departments whenever possible."

Several of Conant's overall recommendations for the education and certification of teachers for elementary and secondary schools are now being tried out in a few universities and colleges with the cooperation of the certifying agencies in the states in which these institutions are located. Northwestern University, for example, has published a brochure describing its pro-

[81] *Ibid.*, see Chapter 7, "The Education of Elementary School Teachers."

[82] *The College Teaching of English*, p. 206.

[83] Conant, *op. cit.*, pp. 172-173.

gram based upon some of Conant's recommendations. And, as was mentioned earlier, some cities are providing beginning teachers with an initial probationary year based upon his ideas. But his conviction, apparently based upon his conversations with teachers, that a four-year college program is "more than enough for a high school teacher" is certainly not in keeping with the conclusion generally accepted throughout MLA, NCTE, the more than 100 universities offering fifth-year M.A.T. programs, and several states that five years of college preparation should be the minimum for future teachers for the elementary and the secondary schools.

Yet despite the differences within the profession concerning some of Conant's recommendations, the entire profession is indebted to him for the thoughtful, thorough, imaginative attention he has given over the past few years to our junior and senior high schools, to schools in slums and suburbs, and to the education of teachers. In the long run, some of his most radical recommendations may yet prove to be the most worthwhile in nudging the educational enterprise along.

THE *Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges* prepared for the NCTE by the Commission on the English Curriculum was also published in 1963. This volume represents by far the most comprehensive study yet attempted of the recruitment and the preservice and inservice education of teachers for the elementary schools and teachers of English for secondary schools and colleges. Thirty-eight specialists in English, in the teaching of English at all levels of our educational system, and in English education contributed to this report.

They point out that the responsibility for recruiting qualified future teachers of English actually begins with the elementary and secondary schools and the communities they serve, especially in communities having chronic shortages of teachers. In the colleges, the responsibility belongs to the departments of English and education.[84]

The committee of specialists in elementary education, principally Dora V. Smith, Alvina T. Burrows, Ruth G. Strickland, and Mildred A. Dawson, recommends programs for the general education, academic, and professional education of teachers for elementary schools. Their discussion and analysis are more comprehensive than Conant's. As a guide to those planning programs relevant to a teacher's professional responsibilities, the writers first present a detailed analysis of what an elementary school teacher does on a typical day working with children, in teaching reading, literature, writing, speech, and listening. The sample programs selected from among those in colleges and universities throughout the country and the recommendations illustrate how preservice and inservice education contribute to a candidate's liberal education and to his learning how to fulfill his professional responsibilities as a teacher of children.

Because on a typical day in an elementary school class the teacher devotes 40-60 per cent of his time to various aspects of the English language arts, the following requirements are recommended for *all* students preparing to meet the realities of teaching in elementary schools:

> Regardless of the schedule of majors and minors, all elementary school teachers should be required to take in addition to freshman English a course in advanced composition; one in the structure, historical development, and social function of the English language; and two in literature, one covering major writers in American literature and one in English or world masterpieces.
>
> Especially significant, also, for all elementary school teachers are adequate courses in speech (such as Fundamentals of Speech, the Oral Interpretation of Literature, Speech Disorders of Children, or Creative Dramatics), and in Children's Literature and Book Selection.
>
> Students preparing to teach in the elementary school should have enough undergraduate work in one academic area and preferably in two to be eligible later to pursue graduate courses in them.[85]

[84] *The Education of Teachers of English*, pp. 6-8.

[85] *Ibid.*, pp. 90-91.

Such requirements would help correct the deficiencies in teachers' preparation resulting from the shamefully low requirements in certification reported in *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*.[86] To further ensure the adequacy of the preparation of the beginning teacher, the committee recommended that all candidates for teaching in elementary schools be required to complete a five-year program. But whether the program extends for four or five years, the candidate should acquire throughout his last two or three years of preparation—rather than during a fifth year only—the professional knowledge, understanding, appreciation, and skills appropriate to his contributing to the education of children during their first eight years in public schools. Included also are detailed discussions of courses essential to a program of professional education, a variety of sample programs, and specific recommendations for the content of these courses.

Recommendations for the preparation of teachers of English for secondary schools are also far too comprehensive to be reported here except in general terms. The committees of specialists in the various aspects of English and English education who wrote these chapters recommend preparation intended to be in keeping not only with realities of present-day secondary schools but also with discernible future developments. They urge colleges and universities to establish institution-wide committees on teacher education to help coordinate the full resources of the institution to the preparation of teachers, particularly in furthering productive cooperation between academic departments and departments of education in appointing qualified faculty to work with future teachers, in planning programs and courses, and in recruiting and advising these students. The nature and possibilities of joint appointments are described in some detail in Volume V.[87]

Because no research has yet indicated that a particular program has proved to be significantly better than all others in producing effective teachers of English, the writers offer several examples of existing patterns and then recommend what they consider essential and what seem to be justifiable proportions of emphases: about 40 per cent to general education, about 40 per cent to the teaching major and related courses, and the rest to professional education.

The essentials in a teaching major in English closely resemble those emerging for several years and are now stipulated in the Guidelines: a major of about thirty-six semester hours in preparation in the history of the English language, modern English language, advanced composition, speech, oral interpretation of literature, dramatics, English literature, American literature, world literature, contemporary literature, drama, poetry, fiction, principles and methods of literary criticism, and journalism. Such a program would fill the serious gaps in the preparation of teachers of English in secondary schools as reported in *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*. The content of many of these courses is discussed in detail in Volume V.

The preparation in professional education is also presented comprehensively. Some special features include the making of a "case for professional education," in recognition of criticisms of elements in the usual programs, recommendations on the purposes and substance of essential courses, and especially detailed descriptions of courses in methods of teaching English, in directed observations, and supervised teaching.[88] Because graduates of even an ideal program, if one ever existed or could be created, are novices when they begin their first full-time teaching, the report also includes extensive discussions and examples of inservice programs and of what colleges and universities might do in making follow-up studies of their graduates.

The many writers contributing to this report strove to make it comprehensive, up-to-date, and forward-looking. But many problems remain. Of these, the authors identified three deserving special attention:

---

[86] *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, pp. 43-49.

[87] *Ibid.*, pp. 318-322.

[88] For an informative article on what colleges can do to improve student teaching see John E. Reedy, "The Role of the College in Improving the Quality of Student Teaching in English," *CEE Newsletter*, Number 9 (May 1967) 3-6.

(1) One of the criticisms of teacher education is that "professional educators have not yet developed an adequate unifying theory [of teacher education]; until such schema are available, the design of alternate programs of teacher education must go begging."[89] Do we have a unifying theory? Is it desirable or possible to develop one? (2) We do not yet have persuasive evidence of what the indispensable elements of an ideal program for preparing teachers of English might be. (3) How will the profession solve the continuing problem of recruiting enough academically talented students for careers in teaching to meet the demands?

ANOTHER major development directly related to the education of teachers of English in elmentary and secondary schools occurred during 1963-64. In the opening chapter of *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (1961), "What Has To Be Done about the National Need to Improve the Teaching of English?" the Committee on National Interest recommends, among other sensible ideas, that conferences be called of "college and university personnel concerned with the education of teachers of English." Among the groups suggested were chairmen of the departments of English. As already pointed out, such an organization was founded the next year. Another group was the specialists in English education. To what extent this suggestion may have been a factor in subsequent developments may not be entirely clear, of course. Furthermore, several persons prominent in English education participated in the Allerton Seminar in 1962. Nevertheless, about this time, some leaders in English education—notably Dwight L. Burton, Florida State University; James R. Squire, then Executive Secretary of the NCTE; J. N. Hook, University of Illinois; Robert C. Pooley, University of Wisconsin; Stanley Kegler, University of Minnesota—decided to call a national meeting of specialists in English education, to be held at Indiana University in March 1963. More than three hundred attended. A similar number attended the second annual meeting held at the University of Illinois in 1964, at which a permanent Conference on English Education was proposed as an organization within the NCTE.[90] Burton was elected the first chairman of the Conference. The organization was officially established at the third annual meeting, held at the University of Kentucky in March 1965. Burton includes in his statement published in the first *Newsletter* the objectives of the Conference as defined in the constitution, the first of which is "to provide an opportunity to discuss the organization and teaching of courses within the realm of English education and the preservice and continuing education of teachers of English." A realistic, forward-looking agenda for the Conference—"Looking Ahead with the CEE—An Important Message from Chairman J. N. Hook and Past Chairman Dwight L. Burton"—was published in the *CEE Newsletter*, Number 6 (October 1966). Some of the papers presented at the annual conferences appear in a follow-up monograph entitled *Selected Addresses*, published by the NCTE. Additional information about the activities of the Conference appears in the *Newsletter* published three or four times a year.

Unfortunately, there is no room here even to mention many of the papers published in *Selected Addresses*. But one should be: James R. Squire's address, "The Impact of New Programs on the Education of Teachers of English," given at the Fourth Conference on English Education in 1966. Squire is concerned lest a statement made in a report published by the Fund for the Advancement of Education be true also in the field of English: that curriculum reform in the U. S. does not affect the education of future teachers enough because people in teacher education tend not to be directly involved with curricular developments in the schools.[91] His purpose in this address was

---

[89] Elmer R. Smith, ed., *Teacher Education: A Reappraisal* (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962), pp. 14-15.

[90] Dwight L. Burton, "An Organization About To Be Born," *CEE Newsletter*, Number 1 (February 1965) 2.

[91] *New Trends in English Education, Selected Addresses* (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1967), p. 7. This observation seems to apply to the 1930s and 1940s when people in English education apparently did not make the report, *An Experience Curriculum*, a central part of

to call to the attention of specialists in English education the following curricular developments he thought should be incorporated in programs educating teachers for the elementary schools and teachers of English for secondary schools: (1) A Reconsideration of the Place of Oral English; (2) A New Stress on the Psychology of Learning; (3) A Vigorous Reappraisal of Supervision of Student Teaching; and (4) An Awareness of All Forces Affecting English Education. He closed with this timely exhortation:

> It is not my intent to deprecate the splendid efforts in the many projects described at this conference. I say only that those of us concerned about the future of English teaching must watch carefully all developments in English research and scholarship so that we see both the forest and the trees. Let us not forget the continuing contributions of individuals [such as Northrup Frye, Wayne Booth, Owen Thomas, H. A. Gleason, Jr., Paul Roberts].
>
> Emerging from the projects are new insights which clearly indicate a tremendous potential for strengthening teacher education programs. Whether the potential can be wisely utilized in our schools will depend upon the wisdom, persistence, imagination of those concerned with English education and the teaching of English. As we consider new ideas, let us think not only of what they mean for the schools—but of what they mean for us. What new fields of study? What new programs of self-study? What new advanced research? What new designs in course structure? The potential of the projects can ultimately be realized only if the boldness and excitement of many new English programs are matched by bold new programs in teacher education. The projects are showing us the way. But do we know enough? Do we have the courage to follow?[92]

UNFORTUNATELY, the following developments can be mentioned only enough to place them in the chronological development of the field. Furthermore, recent documents are readily available. Among these is the follow-up report of the NCTE Committee on National Interest, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*.[93] Volume V contains chapters on follow-up studies and inservice education. But this National Interest publication on continuing education is much more informative on the "State of the Profession, 1964." The Committee presents its comprehensive surveys revealing the inadequacies in preservice and continuing education programs and in the supervision of teachers of English. It reports also its findings on the college preparation of teachers in elementary schools and English teachers in secondary schools, the kinds of courses they tend to take in college, and the kinds of courses, institutes, and conferences experienced teachers recommend and would be interested in attending. The Committee suggests practical improvements in college programs in teacher education, in supervision in schools, cities, and states, and in what districts and institutes might do to help teachers improve their professional competence. It also points out what was then the relationship between the amount of federal money available to teachers in fields other than English and the infinitesimal dribbles available to teachers of English. The report is a rich resource to all those involved with the preparation and continuing education of teachers of English.

It was no mere happenstance that in 1964, the Congress of the U. S. included English and reading among subject-matter

---

the preparation of teachers for elementary schools and teachers of English for secondary schools. The same question arises currently: To what extent are present and future students being prepared to teach English learning about and using the philosophy, materials, and methods contained in the two books and six monographs emerging from the Dartmouth Conference? The same could be asked about the use of materials developed in the curriculum study centers.

---

92 *Ibid.*, p. 14.

93 (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1964).

fields in which institutes would be funded through the extended and revised National Defense Education Act. The tremendous efforts made by officers of the NCTE and closely allied organizations, particularly by James R. Squire and the Committee on National Interest, effectively educated members of the Congress, the public, and even teachers of English on the lamentable state of the profession in many important respects and on the inescapable need for financial support from the federal government to support institutes and other programs to begin as soon as possible to overcome glaring weaknesses, that is, to put into force at once the "Recommendations Concerning the Continuing Education of Teachers."[94]

In a section entitled "A Final Word" closing *The National Interest and the Teaching of English* (1961), the Committee states that "Present programs for preparing English teachers must be reassessed and new programs developed to assist many practicing teachers. . . . Research must supply better answers for some of the English teachers' urgent questions." And contributors to Volume V also urged institutions to design and test new programs, courses, and professional experiences for teachers.

One research project in the English Program funded by the U. S. Office of Education is designed to experiment with a variety of programs for preparing teachers of English: The Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers (ISCPET). This project began in 1964 and will terminate in 1969. It is centered at the University of Illinois in Urbana, is directed by J. N. Hook, and involves twenty participating colleges and universities throughout the state. Its objectives are the following:

1. To evaluate systematic improvements in programs for preparing teachers in twenty cooperating Illinois colleges and universities.
2. To conduct a number of special studies designed to answer some persistent questions about teacher preparation.
3. To develop a model showing how curricular reforms in English teacher preparation can be effected systematically instead of in the widely prevalent patchwork fashion.[95]

The representatives of the institutions prepared as a working guide a list of "Qualifications of Secondary School Teachers of English: A Preliminary Statement," which is in this issue of the *Journal* pp. 546-9, and is available at the ISCPET headquarters in Urbana. This list has a special feature: the qualifications are classified into those that represent "minimal" competencies, "good" competencies, and "superior." This preliminary statement was prepared before the ETPS project started in September 1965, but can be used to supplement the Guidelines.

The results of the timely research projects and studies underway in the ISCPET will be awaited with considerable interest by those involved with the improvement of the education of teachers of English and of the teaching of English in secondary schools.

One brief item that appeared in 1964 should be of interest to those concerned with inservice education. James R. Squire and Robert F. Hogan extracted from the then forthcoming report, *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English*, some findings of special importance to administrators. Their article, "A Five Point Program for Improving the Continuing Education of Teachers of English," was published in *The Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, February 1964. In it, they call to the principals' attention the following "specific areas in

[94] *Ibid.*, pp. 167-178.

[95] The NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum, *Summary Progress Report of English Curriculum Study and Demonstration Centers* (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1966), p. 40. For further information about ISCPET see the reports by Michael F. Shugrue, "New Materials for the Teaching of English: The English Program of the USOE," *PMLA*, 81 (September 1966 Preprint) and "The Conclusion of the Initial Phase: The English Program of the USOE," *PMLA*, 82 (September 1967 Preprint); these two reports include a brief description of research projects and special studies being conducted by each cooperating institution.

which administrators may work to provide sound continuing education": "Teachers profit from supervision, consultant help, and departmental leadership: . . . from a library of professional books and teaching aids made easily available in their school; . . . from well planned meetings and workshops devoted to the problems involved in teaching English; . . . from attending state, local, and national meetings devoted to the teaching of English; . . . from well planned courses related to the teaching of their subject." Although each of these suggestions must seem obvious, of course, to specialists in English education, the identification and discussion of each may serve well the administrators seeking help in talking with school boards, teachers of English, and neighboring colleges about practical in-service education.

THE summer of 1965 saw the culmination of the NCTE's relentless campaign from 1958 to 1964 dedicated to persuading the Congress to include English and reading among the subjects eligible for categorical NDEA institutes for experienced teachers of English and reading in elementary and secondary schools. Measured by the needs of about 900,000 teachers in elementary schools and about 100,000 teachers of English in secondary schools, the scope of the English and reading institutes in 1965 may seem modest indeed. But when compared to the almost exclusion of English teachers from the benefits of federal funds for educational programs,[96] the support for institutes for teachers of English and reading seemed like a bonanza grander than a Las Vegas jackpot: $5,500,000 for 105 institutes for teachers of English attended by some 4,800 teachers in the elementary and secondary schools who were taught by more than five hundred college and high school teachers.[97] In part, because of the haste in which proposals for these first institutes had to be prepared after the Congress included English in mid-October, many of the programs offered in the approved institutes were closely patterned after the so-called "tripod" curriculum of the CEEB institutes of 1962. Many of the college teachers who had participated in the CEEB program also prepared proposals for NDEA institutes. But others who had found the CEEB courses too heavy offered institutes built around two subjects, frequently a combination of modern English language and advanced writing, though others offered literary criticism, logic, critical thinking. Some were offered for departmental chairmen, supervisors, and specialists in English education during the summers of 1966 and 1967. In 1967, one six-week institute was held in Austria for American teachers of secondary school English engaged in teaching American students attending Department of Defense Schools and other kinds in Europe extending from Norway to Iran.

A special feature of the institutes in 1965-67 was that each participant had made available to him free a sizable sampling of experimental curricular materials being developed in twenty-five Curriculum Study Demonstration Centers. This windfall was made possible by the USOE when it li-

---

[96] The Committee on National Interest reports in 1964 in *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* that: "During the first four years of foreign language institute programs under the National Defense Education Act, 10,321 teachers received instruction in 218 modern foreign language institutes and that, during 1962 alone, the National Science Foundation supported 911 institutes for some 40,800 science and mathematics teachers, 90 percent of them from the elementary and secondary schools. . . . During fiscal 1962, also, four federal agencies expended $74,906,000 in direct support to improve the competence of elementary, secondary, and college teachers, yet not one cent of assistance was provided for English and humanities" (pp. 69-70).

[97] Michael F. Shugrue, "National English Projects and Curriculum Change," *The English Curriculum in the Secondary School, The Bulletin* of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, Number 318 (April 1967) 97. According to Shugrue, about 5,300 teachers attended the 126 English institutes in 1966 and approximately 3,400 attended the 95 in 1967. For an evaluation of the institutes in 1965 see Donald J. Gray, *The 1965 NDEA Institutes in English*, Report of a Pilot Study To Develop Criteria for Evaluating NDEA Institutes in English (Modern Language Association of America and the National Council of Teachers of English, April 1966).

censed MLA and the NCTE to establish the English Institute Materials Center (EIMC) and provided funds for preparing and distributing copies of the experimental materials. Through the superb efforts of Michael F. Shugrue, Director of EIMC, and his staff these materials were distributed to the far-flung institutes, even to the one in Austria.[98] Thousands of English teachers were thereby brought up-to-date on recent developments and experimentation in the English curriculum. These materials were not then available to the public. But the extent to which these materials were used in the institutes may be quite another matter. Here was a significant opportunity for the faculties of the institutes to guard against being bypassed by curricular reforms, as Squire had warned in his aforementioned address, "The Impact of New Programs on the Education of Teachers of English." For three summers, faculties involved in teacher education had opportunities to incorporate the latest developments into their programs for preparing teachers. But whether institutions have generally built them into their preservice and continuing education of teachers is not clear.

At this point, the future of categorical institutes is precarious. They are said to be guaranteed through 1969. By then, however—and perhaps even before—a new wave of what are thought by "frontier thinkers" to be innovative, bold ventures in remaking nothing less than the whole of American education may be in. Surely, nothing so prosaic as helping English teachers improve their work could possibly be sweeping enough to revolutionize the establishment, or so our visionary new leaders seem to have decided—on their own.

Among the NDEA institutes were those for teachers of disadvantaged or culturally different children and youth. A year or so earlier, the Congress had appropriated funds to support the President's program for the "war on poverty." These and other developments demonstrated the country's belated but growing awareness of the crises in the economic, social, health, and educational aspects of the lives of the culturally different in our cities and of minority groups in other parts of the country. Some of the leaders in the NCTE working in large city school systems and long dedicated to offering the best possible, most relevant education to *all* the children in their communities were among those who participated in the institutes for teachers of the disadvantaged and who took the initiative in marshalling resources of the National Council to join the war on poverty but to do so by attacking first impoverished, misdirected education for the disadvantaged.

IN February, 1965, the Executive Committee of the NCTE decided that the Council and the profession needed information about educational programs in the English language arts then being offered the disadvantaged in many parts of the country. Thereupon the Executive Committee appointed the NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged and appointed Richard Corbin and Muriel Crosby Cochairmen. The group achieved the impossible. By November 1965, the Task Force working through its crash program had completed its visits and surveys of 190 programs in 115 districts and agencies in sixty-four cities and towns, including twenty-eight involving the preparation of teachers, and then wrote and published a three hundred page report: *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged*.[99]

In its chapter on teacher education the Task Force discusses the work of the English teachers in schools and institutes and also the preparation to teach English to the disadvantaged offered in twenty-eight programs and ten institutes. It summarized some of its findings as follows:

For many an English teacher a class-

[98] For an account of this procedure and an evaluation of the use of these materials see Michael F. Shugrue *et al.*, *An Evaluation of the Use of English Institute Materials Center Curriculum Materials in NDEA Summer Institutes in English* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1966). See also James D. Barry, "Introduction," and Leo Ruth, "The Uses of EIMC Materials in 1966: Significance for the Future," *The Future of the English Curriculum*, edited by James D. Barry (New York: Modern Language Association, 1967).

[99] (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1965), pp. v, 167.

> room of disadvantaged students is a crucible. In it, otherwise insignificant handicaps are starkly revealed. A gap in preparation, a narrow view of man, a limited tolerance for variety in human nature—any of which might pass unnoticed in another setting—not only come to the surface, but virtually guarantee failure. This failure is rooted partly in general education programs that fail to provide a broad view of man, in academic specialization divorced from the demands of the work, in professional training that provides neither the rationale nor the skill needed for teaching disadvantaged children.[100]

As shown earlier, Coulter cautioned in 1912 against academic specialization divorced from the demands of the work of teaching children. The issue of relevance seems eternal.

On the basis of its analysis of the complex of problems and of the programs designed to prepare teachers of English to meet some of these issues and to help the individual human being who is so inadequately summarized by any identifiable difficulties, the Task Force makes several recommendations. Among them is that the person preparing to teach English to disadvantaged students must study cultural anthropology and urban sociology and have practical experiences that will help him understand, among other factors, "the lives and the learning styles of children in depressed areas," "the psychological and sociological roots of prejudice and the problems within and between ethnic groups," and "develop a positive attitude toward serving in programs for disadvantaged students." Through his study of the English language he must learn "about the structure of language, particularly of the English language, and about language learning. 'Language' here refers [to] not only its sounds, word formation, and syntax but also its social, geographical, and historical manifestations. Of particular but not sole importance is the emerging work in social dialectology." Essential also are his learning to teach reading and his reading widely in literature appropriate to these students. It also recommends that teachers not preparing to teach the disadvantaged should be helped to "understand the problems *and* satisfactions of those who do."[101]

A valuable guide to the reading prospective and inservice teachers of the disadvantaged should do is now available to them: *We Build Together,* A Reader's Guide to Negro Life and Literature for Elementary and High School Use, edited by Charlemae Rollins.[102] This timely guide is a classified, annotated bibliography of books by and about Negroes. It also includes an informative introduction written by Charlemae Rollins and Marion Edman on the nature of these books, criteria for selecting them, examples of books judged accordingly, and on the treatment of stereotypes.

In his preface to the Task Force Report, Richard Corbin puts the case for education in the nation's campaign against the corrosive effects of poverty upon the human being:

> Without the skills, the knowledge, the understandings that only training of the mind provides, there can be no durable solutions to the age-old human problems of vocational independence, slum housing, social disjuncture, and intellectual atrophy that are the fated products of poverty. Without literacy and without the experience of literature, the individual is denied the very dignity that makes him human and a contributing member of our free society.[103]

Somewhat at the other end of the social and educational spectrum appeared another report in 1965: *Freedom and Discipline,* Report of the Commission of the College Entrance Examination Board.[104] It represents the Commission's statement on the nature of the English curriculum in the schools, methods of teaching the components of language, composition, and literature, and recommendations on the preparation of teachers of English as a means

---

[100] *Ibid.,* pp. 167-168.

[101] *Ibid.,* pp. 171-181, *passim.*

[102] Committee for 1967 Revision of *We Build Together* (Champaign, Illinois: NCTE, 1967).

[103] *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged,* p. v.

[104] (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965).

of improving the quality of instruction. Its recommendations for the academic and professional preparation reinforce those implied in the Basic Issues Report, the standards of preparation in *The National Interest and the Teaching of English*, and those stated in Volume V. The recommendations on conditions in the schools most conducive to the effective teaching of English are practicable and highly relevant.

We saw in 1965 the culmination of widely held agreements on what the profession was beginning to believe is adequate preparation of teachers of English for the elementary and secondary schools. The climate was highly favorable for the Advisory Board of the English Teacher Preparation Study to convene in Denver, September 1965, to hold its first meeting and thereby launch the nineteen-month study to develop the Guidelines for the Preparation of Teachers of English. The account of this Study appears elsewhere in this issue of the *English Journal*.

UNDOUBTEDLY, the most significant event in 1966, perhaps in this decade, related to the teaching of English in elementary and secondary schools and indirectly to the education of teachers of English was the Anglo-American Seminar on the Teaching of English held at Dartmouth College during that summer.[105] The two reports on the conference by John Dixon of England and Herbert Muller from Indiana University have already been mentioned. The NCTE is publishing six monographs written by participants.

Of special pertinence here are the sections in the two reports on teacher education. And yet comments on teacher education are meaningful only in the context of what was said and illustrated about the teacher's point of view and functions as a teacher of English. The point of view presented persuasively throughout the Seminar by the school and college teachers from Great Britain emphasized, first, the importance of the teacher's concept of his subject and of the relationship of it and himself to his students, and, second, the inescapable importance of the individual child's experiences, especially those with language: his striving for some concept of self, his encounters with life in and out of school, his use of language in talking and writing as a means of trying to shape himself and his world, his dramatizing of his experiences, his engagement with life experiences underlying literature as a means of seeing himself and his world more clearly. In short, teachers need "help in realizing the full importance of language in society and in the development of an individual's personality and view of reality."[106]

In his summary of the Dartmouth discussion of the nature of English, Dixon, Senior Lecturer in English at Bretton Hall College of Education, Wakefield, Yorkshire, writes:

> To sum up: language is learnt in operation, not in dummy runs. In English, pupils meet to share their encounters with life, and to do this effectively they move freely between dialogue and monologue–between talk, drama and writing; and literature, by bringing new voices into the classroom, adds to the store of shared experience. Each pupil takes from the store what he can and what he needs. In so doing he learns to use language to build his own representational world and works to make this fit reality as he experiences it. . . . In ordering and composing situations that in some way symbolize life as we know it, we bring order and composure to our inner selves.[107]

This point of view involving the teacher, his subject, and his pupils is refreshing. Illustrations provided by the British are impressive. To many Americans at the Seminar, especially to professors of English, all this came as a life-giving breeze fresh

[105] Twenty-one representatives of schools and colleges in Great Britain, one from Canada, and twenty-five from U.S. schools and colleges met for almost a month. Twenty-one consultants from Great Britain, Canada, and the U.S. joined the Seminar for brief periods.

[106] John Dixon, *Growth through English, op. cit.*, p. 108.

[107] *Ibid.*, p. 13. This concept of the role of language was presented by Fred N. Scott in 1903 and this role of literature was viewed somewhat by Barnes.

off the Irish Sea. And the infusion into Americans' discussions of what English teaching is and of how teachers should be prepared accordingly is welcomed indeed; hopefully, it may prove to be revolutionary.

Yet we should not assume that this basic point of view is entirely new in American education. As has been shown throughout this review, it began to appear at least as early as Eliot, it permeates much of what Barnes said from 1918 on, and it is basic to *An Experience Curriculum*, whose writers advocated that an English curriculum should be based upon types of experiences rather than upon specific titles. But somehow we seem to have lost this vision. The British at Dartmouth rendered the American participants a great service not only in reminding us of the child's presence in our classrooms but also by showing *how* to capitalize upon the individual's world and the collection of worlds represented by any class. Perhaps as indicated in the earlier discussion of the section on teacher education in *An Experience Curriculum* and as Squire warned us about the possibility of teacher educators' allowing ourselves to be bypassed by curricular developments, we have somehow failed to make these points of view, concepts, *practices*, and materials *central* in the lives and education of students preparing to teach English. Not one word of all that *An Experience Curriculum* signifies appears in the detailed descriptions of programs of teacher education presented there. Too much was assumed.

Are we now in danger of assuming too much in our broad-front drive for programs of teacher education heavily stacked in favor of academic knowledge? The knowledge is indispensable, of course. The recommendations in the Guidelines represent well the consensus of the profession. But what may be missing here—again—is explicit recognition of the influence of the attitudes, points of view, spirit, sense of awareness of what is going on in the field of the *instructors* teaching the courses and supervising prospective teachers' professional experiences. Perhaps more than a lineup of courses and experiences is needed. The entire Guidelines are a statement of what the *student* should be and know. What is said about instructors? Here is a major factor those undertaking to implement the Guidelines may wish to attend to.

In his brief discussion of teacher education, Dixon expresses his concern with the relationship between programs and the kinds of attitudes and experiences some British delegates advocate for the teacher and his pupils:

> At present, college and university education in both countries, diverse as the systems are, is creating barriers to the teaching of English as envisaged in this report. Clearly students who intend to teach the subject need wide experience in drama, and particularly improvised drama; continuing experience and encouragement in imaginative writing; and a confident grounding in the purposive talk that arises from group learning in an English workshop.
>
> We seriously doubt whether more than a minority of teachers in training approach English in this way. Instead it often appears that the demand for intellectual rigour is so interpreted that it obscures rather than illuminates the process of using language to gain insight into experience at large. Our first concern therefore is that teachers of English at all levels should have opportunities to enjoy and refresh themselves in their subject, using language in operation for all its central purposes—in imaginative drama, writing and speech, as well as the response to literature. Teachers without this experience—who would never think of writing a poem, flinch at the idea of "acting," and rarely enter into discussion of the profounder human issues in everyday experience—are themselves deprived and are likely in turn to limit the experience of their pupils. On the other hand, we were agreed that, just because language is so vital and pervading a concern, mature men and women can surprise themselves by the imaginative power they suddenly realize they possess, given the right opportunity.[108]

[108] *Ibid.*, p. 107. For an excellent example of an American teacher's engaging his students in meaningful talk about Langston Hughes' poem on playing it cool and in illuminating improvised drama see *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged*, *op. cit.*, pp. 118-119.

THUS comes to a close this history of the preparation of teachers of English. It is intended to draw attention to a succession of events, documents, and people; each seems to represent not only a culmination of scattered tendencies but also a gathering of forces for a fresh look ahead. Among the many persons and contributions that might have been considered, the following may have served this dual purpose: the structure and functions of the Committee of Ten and its Report (1892-1894); the professional contributions of Fred N. Scott (1903-1913); the founding of the NCTE in 1911; Hosic's *Report on the Reorganization of English in Secondary Schools* (1917); the work of Walter Barnes (1918-1935); the achievements of the first NCTE Curriculum Commission under the chairmanship of W. Wilbur Hatfield (1929-1940), notably its first report, *An Experience Curriculum* (1935); the appointment of the second Curriculum Commission under the directorship of Dora V. Smith and its five reports (1946-1963); the Conference on Basic Issues (1958); the appearance of *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges* (1963); the NDEA Institutes for the Advanced Study of English (1965-); and the convening of the Dartmouth Conference (1966) in the midst of the nineteen-month English Teacher Preparation Study (1965-1967) that terminated with the publication of the Guidelines in 1967.

Because of the attention given throughout to the significance of the membership and workings of important committees and commissions, the traditional and distinctive features of the English Teacher Preparation Study should also be noted in this context. The historic gap between the worth of recommendations by earlier groups and the failure in many instances to be implemented by official public bodies is clear throughout the decades. But the origins of the recent projects to develop guidelines for the preparation of teachers of sciences and mathematics (1963), of modern foreign languages (1965), and now of English represent a notable shift in the assumption of responsibility for both initiating the studies and seeing that the endorsed guidelines are actually put to use in state agencies having considerable influence and authority. The credit for taking this initiative belongs to the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC) and its Executive Secretary, William P. Viall, who served as Director of the Study.

Also to the credit of NASDTEC is that it did not presume to have the academic and professional expertise to develop by itself guidelines for the preparation of teachers of academic subjects. Therefore, it requested and obtained the co-sponsorship of learned and professional societies in each field; in the present case, MLA and NCTE. These organizations did much more than perfunctorily sponsor the study: they devoted their resources and personnel to supporting the endeavor. The Advisory Board and the Director's staff were comprised of representatives of the three organizations. The associate directors were Michael F. Shugrue, Assistant Secretary for English of MLA, and Eldonna L. Everetts, Assistant Executive Secretary of NCTE. Mr. Shugrue with the able assistance of Mrs. Everetts assumed the enormous responsibility of not only contending with the mountain of paper created by each of the four regional meetings and the national conference but also thoughtfully, patiently sifting out the gems essential to the endlessly evolving drafts of the Guidelines. The combination of the sponsorship and endorsement of the Guidelines by NASDTEC, MLA, and NCTE and of the endorsement of a wide cross section of the profession engaged in the teaching of English at all levels and in preparing teachers of English augurs well for the meaningful influence of the Guidelines upon the education and certification of teachers for elementary schools and teachers of English for secondary schools.

But what now? Certainly one major shift in the focus of American education must be recognized by the entire profession. In the late 1930s, Dora V. Smith saw, as reported earlier, that many experienced teachers deprived of professional assistance in smaller communities needed the help of the NCTE. She had observed that teachers in the larger cities, however, were already being helped by local and national organizations. But by the 1960s, the entire nation had begun to realize that whatever

problems may still be confronting individual teachers in smaller communities seem almost featherlight weighed against the crushing burdens being borne by whole school systems in large urban centers. The very survival of city public school systems may be the ultimate educational issue confronting the nation as well as the cities. From its inception, the National Council of Teachers of English has been responsive to public as well as educational problems. It is urgent indeed that the Council now draw upon its extensive professional and human resources to carry on the valuable contributions made by the Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged by helping institutions and urban communities recruit and prepare teachers qualified by personal attributes, background, education, and experiences to teach English to disadvantaged youth in urban centers and elsewhere.

The Task Force asked that all teachers understand the problems and satisfactions of those who teach the disadvantaged. It did not unanimously agree, however, upon other aspects of programs for teachers of the disadvantaged that should be required of all teachers of English: "work in urban sociology, in teaching standard English as a second dialect, in the literature and the history of American minority groups." Why shouldn't all teachers of English have such preparation? And shouldn't all students who read American literature in public schools and those who take college and university courses in it know about the contributions American Negro writers have been making to our national culture for at least two hundred years and to have read appropriate selections as literature *per se* but also as important commentary upon certain aspects of our history?

It would seem now that programs designed to prepare teachers of English for our schools—wherever located—be based upon the ETPS Guidelines, to be sure. But to make certain the gap between them and the realities of teaching now and in the foreseeable future is as narrow as possible, institutions should supplement the Guidelines with such resources as the following. *Ends and Issues: 1965-1966*, a publication of the NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum provides a good base for identifying some of the realities of teaching English in the public schools today. The materials developed in the Curriculum Study Centers should be evaluated and built into the programs of preservice and continuing education. The information and recommendations in the Task Force's report, *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged*, should be capitalized upon. The two reports on the Dartmouth Conference and the supplementary monographs soon to appear ought to be studied. To these should be added James R. Squire's report on visits to forty-two schools in Great Britain. Soon after 1969 the profession will have the benefit of the results emerging from the experiments and studies being conducted by each of the twenty institutions cooperating in the Illinois State-Wide Curriculum Study Center in the Preparation of Secondary School English Teachers.

It may be some time, however, before the next major projects are launched. But history warns us that we are probably already overlooking in what is now going on around us clues to significant future developments in the teaching of English and in the education of teachers. We must beware lest we neglect the work of individuals, say, of a Charles W. Eliot, a Fred N. Scott, a James F. Hosic, Walter Barnes, W. Wilbur Hatfield, Dora V. Smith, John Dixon, James Britton, David Holbrook, J. N. Hook, Paul Olson, James Moffett, Herbert Kohl, or a James R. Squire. . . .